In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

संस्कृत अकाडमी षष्ठ्यब्दग्रन्थमाला (ii) - 17

नारायणभट्टपादविरचितम्

अपाणिनीयप्रामाण्यसाधनम्

(केन्द्रीयसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयस्य अष्टादशीपरियोजनायाः दुर्लभग्रन्थपुनर्मुद्रणपरियोजनान्तर्गतत्वेन प्रकाश्यते)

प्रधानसम्पादकः

आचार्य के नीलकण्ठः

निदेशकः संस्कृत अकाडमी

सम्पादकः

डा. के आञ्जनेयुलु

सहसम्पादकः परियोजना – अनुसन्धाता च

श्रीमान् के वि सूर्यप्रकाशः

संस्कृत अकाडमी

(केन्द्रीयसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयेन मानिता आदर्शशोधसंस्था)

उस्मानियाविश्वविद्यालयः, हैदराबाद् - 07

2022

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

संस्कृत अकादमी [illegible] (ii) - 17
In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

नारायणभट्टपादविरचितम्

अपाणिनीयप्रामाण्यसाधनम्

(केन्द्रीयसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयस्य अष्टादशीपरियोजनायाः दुर्लभग्रन्थपुनर्मुद्रणपरियोजनान्तर्गतत्वेन प्रकाश्यते)

प्रधानसम्पादकः

आचार्य के नीलकण्ठः

निदेशकः संस्कृत अकाडमी

सम्पादकः

डा. के आञ्जनेयुलु

सहसम्पादकः परियोजना – अनुसन्धाता च

श्रीमान् के वि सूर्यप्रकाशः

संस्कृत अकाडमी

(केन्द्रीयसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयेन मानिता आदर्शशोधसंस्था)

उस्मानियाविश्वविद्यालयः, हैदराबाद् - 07

2022

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Sanskrit Academy Ṣaṣṭhyabda Granthamālā (ii) 16

Apāṇinīya-Prāmāṇya-Sādhanam
(Re-printing of rare book project)
This book is published with the financial support under Ashtadashi Scheme of **Central Sanskrit University, New Delhi**

Publisher
Director, Sanskrit Academy

Copies can be had from:
Director
Sanskrit Academy
Adarsha Shodha Sanstha
Osmania University Campus,
Hyderabad – 500 007

Phone & Fax:
8331021001

Email:
sanskritacademyhyd@gmail.com

Web:
https://sanskritacademy.net/

Printed at
Karshak Art Printers,
Vidyanagar, Hyderabad

Apāṇinīya-Prāmāṇya-Sādhanam

ISBN – 978-93-80171-78-4

© Sanskrit Academy

Year	:	2022
Pages	:	xxxviii +61
Copies	:	300
Price	:	Rs 200

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Sanskrit Academy Ṣaṣṭhyabda Granthamālā (ii)- 17

APĀṆINĪYA-PRĀMĀṆYA-SĀDHANAM

By

NĀRĀYAṆABHAṬṬAPĀDA

(Published under 'Re-printing of rare books project', Ashtadashi scheme of Central Sanskrit University, New Delhi)

Chief -Editor

Prof. K. Neelakantham

Director, Sanskrit academy

Editor

Dr. K Anjaneyulu

Associate Editor & Project Investigator

K V Suryaprakash

Sanskrit Academy

Adarsha Shodha Sanstha

(Recognised by Central Sanskrit University, New Delhi)

Osmania University

Hyderabad – 500 007

2022

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Sanskrit Academy Ṣaṣṭhyabda Granthamālā (ii) 16

Apāṇinīya-Prāmāṇya-Sādhanam
(Re-printing of rare book project)
This book is published with the financial support under Ashtadashi Scheme of **Central Sanskrit University, New Delhi**

Publisher
Director, Sanskrit Academy

Copies can be had from:
Director
Sanskrit Academy
Adarsha Shodha Sanstha
Osmania University Campus,
Hyderabad – 500 007

Phone & Fax:
8331021001

Email:
sanskritacademyhyd@gmail.com

Web:
https://sanskritacademy.net/

Printed at
Karshak Art Printers,
Vidyanagar, Hyderabad

Apāṇinīya-Prāmāṇya-Sādhanam
ISBN – 978-93-80171-78-4

© Sanskrit Academy

Year	:	2022
Pages	:	xxxviii +61
Copies	:	300
Price	:	Rs 200

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Preface

ओम् श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः

।।श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादाः विजयन्ते।।

Grammar is the most important among the six Vedangas. Without grammar one cannot understand even the classical Sanskrit let alone the Vedic.

Indian tradition believes that the shastras to be of divine origin. According to the tradition, Vyakaraṇa was taught by Brahma to Bṛhaspati, Bṛhaspati taught it to Indra, Indra to Bharadvaja, Bharadvāja to Rsis and Rsis taught it to the learned ब्रह्मा बृहस्पतये व्याकरणं प्रोवाच, बृहस्पतिरिन्द्राय, इन्द्रो भरद्वाजाय, भरद्वाजो ऋषिभ्यः ऋषयः ब्राह्मणेभ्यः । According to another tradition the origin of Vyakaraṇa śāstra is siva, therefore Pānini's grammar belongs to Maheśvara sampradaya.

It is mentioned in Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa that the Sanskrit Language was spoken in sentences; individual words padas were not studied. The Rṣis went to Indra and explained their difficulty in learning and understanding the Sanskrit Language. They requested him to find some means to make the language simple so that they can learn it easily. Understanding the difficulties of Rsis, Indra made a division of the padas into Prakrti pratyaya etc. आदौ इयं भाषा अव्याकृता आसीत् ऋषयः इन्द्रं जग्मुः, ते इन्द्रमवोचन्, व्याकुरु, नो भवानिति । ततः इन्द्रः पदानि प्रकृतिप्रत्ययरूपेण विभज्य अस्याः भाषायाः संस्कारं कृतवान् । This prakrti pratyaya vibhāga is

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

called संस्कार and because the language is named as संस्कृत। Yāska in his Nirukta uses the word संस्कार for prakṛti pratyaya vibhāga of the padas.

When Bṛhaspati was teaching grammar to Indra he adopted the method of teaching every pada used in language. The period of teaching went beyond thousand divine years still the study was not over. Therefore there was no need to study every pada, most probably with this experience behind him Indra devised the method of constructing the padas with prakṛti and pratyaya This is mentioned by Bhāṣykāra as follows बृहस्पतिः इन्द्राय दिव्यवर्षसहस्रं प्रतिपदव्याकरणं प्रोवाच । नान्तं जगाम । बृहस्पतिः प्रवक्ता, इन्द्र अध्येता तथापि नान्तं जग्मतुः तस्मात् नाध्येतव्यं प्रतिपदव्याकरणम् ।

In fact Rgveda contains much number of instances which point out the Vyakaraṇa, some of them are given here.

1. यज्ञेन यज्ञमयजन्त देवा (1-164.50) Here यज्ञ is explained by Yāska as यजति कर्म।

2. ये सहांसि सहसा सहन्ते (6.65.9) Here Unadi vrttikāra says सह धातोः असुन् प्रत्ययः

3. पूर्वी रश्नान्तावश्विना (8-5-31) Here Niruktkara explains अश्विनौ अश्विनौ यत् व्यश्नुवाते सर्वम्

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

4.स्तोतृभ्यो मंहते मघम् 1.11.3 मघमिति धननामधेयम्, मंहते दानकर्मण: this is how Yāska explained the word मघम्

5. धान्यमसि धिनुहि देवान् (यजुर्वेद 1-20) the word धान्य is explained by Bhāsyakāra as धिनोतेः धान्यम् ।

Everyone knows that grammar is a very difficult Sastra, there are references in सूत्रग्रन्था and that a student was required to study Sanskrit grammar for at least for 16 years to gain sound insight into the śāstra षोढश वर्षाणि व्याकरणम् अधियीत । Because of this difficulty of the śāstra, Jayanta Bhaṭṭa in न्यायमञ्जरी says that one would need full life time to know this śāstra.

There was understandably any number of grammars before the advent of Pāṇini. आचार्य युधिष्ठिर मीमांसक has mentioned 85 of them. Pāṇini also has mentioned the names of many grammarians, out of them the names **of** eight vyakaraṇas including that of Panini, are these-

ऐन्द्रं चान्द्रं काशकृत्स्नं कौमारं शाकटायनम्

सारस्वतं चापिशलं शाकल्यं पाणिनीयकम् ॥

Pāṇini's grammar has overshadowed the earlier Vyakaraṇas as well as many a later Vyakaraṇas. There are many reasons for this. One of them is Aṣṭādhyāyī deals with लौकिक as well as वैदिक Padas. Point is Pāṇini did not go into the

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

philosophical questions of काल like वर्तमान, भूत, भविष्य। Therefore his grammar is known as अकालकं पाणिन्युपज्ञं, here we must remember that the Prātiskhyas deal only with Vedic grammar and other grammars with classical Sanskrit language where as his grammar deals with वैदिक as well as लौकिक padas.

In addition पञ्चाङ्गव्याकरणम् Panini had made provision in his rules for the inclusion of new words which may come into usage in future. This is done in two ways आकृतिगण and निपातन. To give an example the word बलाहक as वारिवाहक,, commenting on these words काशिकाकार says यदिह लक्षणेनानुपपन्नं तत्सर्वं निपातनात् सिद्धम् (3-1-123), in another place he says प्रकृतिः प्रत्ययः आदेशः कालविशेषः इति सर्वमेतत् निपातनात् लक्ष्यते (5-3- 22). At some other place काशिकाकार opines that these are no point in insisting on following the rules of Panini exactly. He says विंशत्यादयः गुणशब्दाः यथाकथञ्चित् व्युत्पाद्याः नात्रावयवार्थे अभिनिवेष्टव्यम् एतदपि सर्वं स्वाभाविकमेव (5-1- g58). And परमार्थतस्तु गुण शब्दा एते यथाकथञ्चित् व्युत्पाद्यन्ते नात्र प्रकृतिप्रत्यययोः अभिनिवेशः । this confirms what Patanjali said in Mahābhāṣyam, very often लोकः प्रमाणम् शिष्टाः प्रमाणम्।

From the study of Aṣṭādhāyi it's very clear that Sanskrit was a spoken language. For instance Pāṇini mentions Vegetables, grains, vessels, agriculture including ploughing etc. in his

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

grammar. For example in काशिकावृत्ति, we find 'द्वितीयाकरोति' this means the former is ploughing his field twice; another word is शम्बाकरोति। Vṛttikāra explains it as अनुलोमकृष्टं विलोमं करोति.

Pāṇini, having taken the usage of the language of his times spoken in different parts of the country, collected the words and formulated the rules in his sūtras. It must have been a stupendous task but he accomplished it with unparalleled genius. Bhāṣyakāra Patanjali shows great respect to Panini, while commenting on the sutra वृध्दिरादैच् he says--

प्रमाणभूत आचार्यः दर्भपवित्रपाणिः शुचावकाशे प्राङ्मुख उपविश्य महता प्रयत्नेन सूत्राणि प्रणयति स्म । तत्राऽशक्यं वर्णेनापि अनर्थकेन भवितुम् किं पुनरियता सूत्रेण i.e. Justifying the Sūtra Pātañjali says being an authority, Panini, sat in a clean place facing the east with darbha grass is hand and formulated his Sūtras. Hence, not a single Varna in the whole Aṣṭādhyāyi can be dispensed with let alone this whole sutra. After Panini many numbers of grammars are written by different authors like Abhayanandi, chandragomin, Bhojaraja, Hemachandra and śākaṭāyana. The grammatical works of all these were meant to supplement पाणिनीयम् and were composed taking some new words which came into usage in course of time, just as Vartikas of Vararuchi and Mahabhashyam of

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Patanjali which were supplemented to the Panini's Astadhyayi in earlier times. Here we have to take the famous statement यथोत्तरं मुनीनां प्रामाण्यम् in order to accept the rules of later grammatical works and even the usages of great authors Valmiki, Vyasa, Bhasa, kalidasa, Bhavabhuti and others. Illustrious commentators like Mahamahopadhyaya mallinatha and others also have referred to the other grammarians Chandragomin, Bhojaraja and Abhayanandi and others.

Coming to the present book अपाणिनीयप्रामाण्यसाधनम् composed by Narayanabhattapada. He was famous as Melputtur Narayana bhattatiri. He was born in the year 1556 and died in the year 1646[1]. He was a well versed scholar of various shastras and had composed 45 books[2]. His **Narayaneeyam** a devotional Sanskrit work is very popular and it is recited even now in the temples lord Krishna in Kerala and Tamilnadu. **Prakriyasarvasvam, Dhatukavyam** are some of the prominent books composed by him.

The present अपाणिनीयप्रामाण्यसाधनम् was published by Sri E R Srikrishna Sharma from Sri Venkateswara University oriental Research Institute Tirupati in 1968. We have taken the detailed introduction of this book as it is given by Sri E R Srikrishna Sharma in that edition of S.V.O.R.I. here

---

[1] According to some other scholars Narayanabhattatiri lived till the year 1666

[2] The detailed list is given in Sanskrit introduction of this book.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

in the beginning and we are greatly indebted to him.

Now we are happy to bring out this from Sanskrit Academy under the reprint of rare books project. This would help the people pursuing research on science of Sanskrit grammar.

I appreciate and congratulate my beloved student Dr K. Anjaneyulu who made a thorough study on Narayanabhatta while pursuing his doctoral research. He has come across this **Apaanineeya praamaanyasaadhanam** and studied this book well and presented to me with complete details of history of Narayanabhatta in Sanskrit.

I also congratulate and acknowledge the integrity of Sri K. V. Suryaprakash the senior research assistant in the academy and in charge of project of reprinting of rare books.

I dearly think the help of my amicable colleagues Dr V. Subrahmanyam and Dr K. Varalakshmi, Dy Directors and Dr Joshi Santhosh Kumar, Research Assistant for their support at every movement in all the publications of Academy. These four have been working tirelessly for bringing out many books under the project of reprinting of rare books sanctioned by the Central Sanskrit University, New Delhi. I congratulate them and convey thanks to our young research scholar Mr Joshi Bharadwaj.

I thank Prof Srinivasa Varkhedi Hon'ble V.C. and Prof. Ranjit Kumar Barman Registrar I/c Central

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Sanskrit University, New Delhi for their continuous encouragement and for sanctioning such projects to Sanskrit Academy. I thank our Hon'ble Chairman Prof. D. Ravinder V. C. and Prof. P. Lakshminarayana Registrar of Osmania University for their amicable support for the development of Sanskrit Academy. I thank Prof. Gayatri Muralikrishna Director, Aadharsh Institutions in CSU Delhi.

I thank Karshak Art Printers Vidyanagar, Hyderabad for printing this book on time.

सुधीजनविधेयः

Prof. K. Neelakantham

Director

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Abbreviations

प्र.सर्व.	प्रक्रियासर्वस्वम्
सं.व्या.चरि.	संस्कृतव्याकरणचरितम्
धा.का.	धातुकाव्यम्
का. मा.	काव्यमाला
उणा.	उणादिसूत्रम्
गु.	गुच्छकः
सा.दर्प.	साहित्यदर्पणः
पृ.सं.	पृष्टसंख्या
PS	Prakriyasarvasva
DSG	Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar
MB	Mahābhāsya
SSG	Systems of Sanskrit Grammar
Pā.	Panini
Va.	Varthikam
K.	Kashika
His. Skt. Lit.	History of Sanskrit literature

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

प्रस्तावना

श्रीरस्तु

संस्कृतवाङ्मये शास्त्रकाराणां, विदुषां कवीनाञ्च जीवनेतिवृत्तं पुष्टप्रमाणैः वक्तुमशक्यम्। यतो हि ते महान्तः आत्मपरिचयदानेन न प्रख्यापयन्ति। वस्तुतः भारतीयानां ग्रन्थकाराणाम् आत्मनः प्रतिष्ठानं प्रख्यापनं वा न हि तेषां विषयः, अपि तु ग्रन्थस्य प्रतिपाद्यविषयस्य निरूपणमेव तात्पर्यमासीत्। अतः संस्कृतसाहित्ये प्रायः सर्वेषां देशकालादीनां निर्धारणं न सुकरम्। भास-कालिदास महाकवयोऽत्र प्रमाणं सन्ति। नारायणभट्टस्य विषयेऽपि सैव समस्योत्पन्ना। यतोऽयं विद्वत्कविः स्वग्रन्थेषु स्वनामोल्लेखनमात्रमेवाकार्षीत् स्वेतिवृत्तविषये स्वपूर्वजानाञ्च विषये वा न किमप्यवादीत्। अतः अस्य देशकालाद्यैतिह्यकथने पण्डिताः संशोधकाः भिन्नाभिप्रायान् प्रकटीचक्रुः। अत्रेदानीं तस्य ग्रन्थानां साहाय्येन पूर्वोत्तरवर्तिनां, राजाश्रयादीनां च प्रस्तावनादिभिः प्रमाणपुरस्सरं तस्य स्थितिकालादीनां विषये विचार्यते।

नारायभट्टस्य परिचयः

केरलप्रान्ते त्रीन् महानुभावान् "भट्टत्रि" इति संबोधयन्ति स्म। संस्कृतसाहित्यैतिहासिकानां मतानुसारं **भट्टत्रि** इत्यस्य भट्टत्रयः इत्यर्थः। ते त्रयः श्रेष्ठो दार्शनिकः जगद्गुरुः

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

आदिशङ्कराचार्यः, बिल्वमङ्गलं स्वामियार्, मेलपुत्तुरु नारायणभट्टश्च।

महादार्शनिकोऽयं नारायणभट्टः केरलदेशे निलानदीतीरे(भारतपुष्पा) नवनारायणदेवालयस्योत्तरप्रान्ते उपरिवनग्राम इति प्रथितस्य चन्दनक्कावु[3] (पाटीरवाटी)नाम ग्रामे नम्पूतिरि ब्राह्मणपण्डितपरिवारे जातः इति ज्ञायते।[4] उपरिनवग्रामः इति संस्कृतपदस्य मेल्पुत्तुरु इल्लम् इति प्रचाल्यमानः अर्थः। अधुना मेल्पुत्तुरु एव कुरुम्पत्तूरु इत्याख्यायते। मूलतः वेत्ताट्टु नट्टुराजस्य शासनाधीनमिदं स्थानं कालान्तरे आङ्ग्लेयानां काले मद्रास प्राविन्श् इत्यस्य पोन्नानि तालुकाधीने आसीत्।

नारायणभट्टस्य पिता प्रसिद्धकेरलीयो संस्कृतगवेषको मीमांसाशास्त्रस्याध्येता उपरिनवग्रामवासी(मेल्पुत्तूरु) ब्रह्मश्री मातृदत्तो नाम द्विजेन्द्रः। अस्य माता केरलदेशस्य प्रसिद्धे

---

3 तत्तादृशमहिमायं केरलेषु निलानदीतीरपरिसरवर्ति नाना नारायणक्षेत्रमुत्तरेण चन्दनक्कावुसंज्ञिते देशे सुप्रसिद्ध मेल्पुत्तूर् भवनाभिजातः कोऽपि नारायणनामा द्विजन्मा। सोऽयं बलवदलसमतिः परिशीलित कतिपय काव्यनाटकादि साहित्यखण्डः शास्त्राभ्यासमकुर्वन्नितस्ततोऽटाट्यमान आसीत्। प्र.सर्व., प्रस्तावना

4 1) डा.यस् वेङ्कटसुब्रह्मण्यम्,प्र.सर्व.,प्रस्तावना, 2) डा. जि.गङ्गाधरन् नायर्, सं.व्या.चरि.,पृ.सं. 55.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

पय्यूरुपरिवारे जाता इति ज्ञायते। नारायणभट्टस्य जीवनविशेषाः अवधार्यन्ते यथा प्रक्रियासर्वस्वे -

भूखण्डे केरलाख्ये सरितामिह निलामुत्तरेणैव नावा –
क्षेत्रे गव्यूतिमात्रे पुनरुपरिनवग्रामनाम्नि स्वधाम्नि।
धर्मिष्ठाद् भट्टतन्त्राद्यखिलमतपटोर्मातृदत्तद्विजेन्द्रा –
ज्जातो नारायणाख्यो निरवहदतुलां देवनारायणाज्ञाम्।।[5]

धातुकाव्यव्याख्याने –

"श्रीनारायणनामकोपरिनवग्रामस्वधामाभिधाक्षोणिदेवकवि प्रकाण्डरचितं यद्धातुकाव्यं शुभम्"[6] इति रामपणिपादानां प्रस्तुतिः।

तथैव नारायणभट्टस्यैतिह्यविषये, तस्य गुरुपरम्परामधिकृत्य च बहवः विचाराश्चावलोक्यन्ते। तथापि नारायणभट्टः पितुः सकाशे मीमांसादि शास्त्राणि, माधवाचार्यो नाम्नः पण्डितस्य सकाशे वैदिकवाङ्मयं, दामोदरार्यस्य सकाशे तर्कशास्त्रं, त्रिक्कण्टियार् अच्युतपिशरोति इति पण्डितस्य सकाशे व्याकरण शास्त्रञ्चाधीतवानिति ज्ञायते। सप्रमाणमुच्यते यत् -

मीमांसादि स्वतातान्निगममविकलं माधवाचार्यात्
तर्कं दामोदरार्यादपि पदपदवीमच्युतार्याद् बुधेन्द्रात्।

---

5 प्र.सर्व., प्रस्तावना पृ. सं. 3

6 धातुकाव्यम्, पृ.सं. 279

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

तेषां कारुण्ययोगात् किमपि च कवितामाप्नवं कर्म मे तद्
भूयात् कृष्णार्पणं मे भवतु च सततं धीरधारेः कथायाम्।।[7]
इति।

एवमेवास्य नारायणभट्टस्य अग्रजः दामोदरार्यः(दामोदाराचार्यः) इति, अनुजः मातृदत्तः इति, स्वगुरोः अच्युतपिषारोति इत्येतस्य भ्रातृजा एव अस्य पत्नी इति (बालकलत्रं सौख्यम् – कलिप्रमाणदृशा 1633 अप्रैल्, 7 अथवा 808 मेटम्-1), ताराशशाङ्कः इत्यस्य लेखकः कृष्णकविः अस्य पुत्रः इति पण्डिताः प्रास्तुवन्।

नारायणभट्टस्य कालः

नारायणभट्टः क्रीस्तोः पश्चात् 1560-1666 मध्यकालिकः इति पुष्टप्रमाणैः पण्डितानां प्रमाणानि उपलभ्यन्ते।[8] तथापि केषाञ्चित् पण्डितानां वैमत्यं वर्तते तच्च सहेतुकं परिशील्यते यथा -

1) तारकवधः इति चम्पूकाव्ये नारायणभट्टः *"चित्तम् बाणेन साकम्"* इति प्रास्तौत्। अस्य *चित्तम् बाणेन साकम् (1705366 दिवसाः)* इत्यस्य कटपयादि नियमानुसारं केरलीय कलिसंख्यामानिन्याधारेण क्रीष्टाब्दस्य 1568 मार्च् मासस्य 11

---

7 प्र.सर्व., प्रस्तावना

8 डा. जि. गङ्गाधरन् नायर्, सं.व्या.चरि. पृ.सं. 56

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

दिनाङ्को भवति। अत नारायणभट्टः क्रीष्टाब्दे 1568 तमे वर्षे केरलप्रान्ते न्यवसदिति ज्ञायते।

2) नारायणीयम् इति ग्रन्थे नारायणभट्टः *"आयुरारोग्यसौख्यम्"* इति भगवतः प्रार्थनया काव्यं समापयति। तत्र *आयुरारोग्यसौख्यम् (1712210 दिवसाः)* इत्यस्य केरलीय कलिसंख्यामानिन्याधारेण क्रीष्टाब्दस्य 1586 दिसम्बर् मासस्य 6 दिनाङ्को भवति। तेन नारायणभट्टः क्रीष्टाब्दे 1586 तमे वर्षे केरलप्रान्ते न्यवसदित्यनुमीयते।

3) *सर्वमतसङ्ग्रहः* इति ग्रन्थे नारायणभट्टः *"संसरत्यर्के सम्यक्"* इति समापयति। *संसरत्यर्के सम्यक् (1712045 दिवसाः)* इत्यस्य केरलीय कलिसंख्यामानिन्याधारेण क्रीष्टाब्दस्य 1586 जून् मासस्य 24 दिनाङ्को भवति। तस्मात् नारायणभट्टः क्रीष्टाब्दे 1586 तमे वर्षे केरलप्रान्ते न्यवसदिति कथ्यते।

4) अयमच्युतगुरुकृपया पाणिनिकात्यायनादिकारुण्यात्।

---

9 अज्ञात्वा ते महत्वं यदिह निगदितं विश्वनाथ क्षमेथाः,
स्तोत्रं चैतत्सहस्रोत्तर मधिकतरं त्वत्प्रसादाय भूयात्।
द्वेधा नारयणीयं श्रुतिषु च जनुषां स्तुत्यता वर्णनेन,
स्पीतं लीलावतारैरिदमिह कुरुतामायुरारोग्य सौख्यम्।। नारायणीयान्ते (28 वृश्चिक. 762 यम्.इ. कलिदिनसंख्यदिशा (1586 क्रीष्टाब्दे)

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

यत्नः फलप्रसूः स्यात् कृतरागरसोऽद्य शब्दमार्गजुषाम्।।[10]

इति प्रक्रियासर्वस्वे प्रस्तुतम्। इत्यत्र *यत्नःफलप्रसूःस्यात् (1723201दिवसाः), कृतरागरसोद्य (1723261 दिवसाः)* इत्यादयः कलिदिनसंख्यादिशा प्रायः 1616 इति बोध्यते। तस्माच्चायं क्रीष्टाब्दस्य 1616 वर्षीयो इति ऐतिहासिकाः प्रस्तुवन्ति। नारायणभट्टस्य पारम्परिकगुरुः अच्युतपिषारोति क्रीष्टाब्दस्य 1621तमे वर्षे दिवङ्गताः।[11] अतः अयं नारायणभट्टः तस्य समकालिकः इत्यनुमीयते।

5) केरलदेशस्य अम्बरनदी(अम्बलप्पुजा) राज्ञः केम्पकेसरी देवनारायणस्य आस्थाने धर्मीकीर्तेः रूपावतारः इव प्रक्रियसर्वस्वम् इत्यलिखदिति ज्ञायते।[12] अतः नारायणभट्टः क्रीष्टाब्दस्य 1566-1622 मध्यकालिको इति मन्यते।

---

10 प्र.सर्व., प्रस्तावना

11 विद्यात्मा स्वरसर्पाम् (1724514 – कलिमानम्), महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी), पञ्चमं कुसुमम्, पृ.सं. 42

12 सोऽथ कदाचन राजा स्वगुणैराकृष्य सन्निधिं नीतम्। श्रीमातृदत्तं सूनुं नारायणसंज्ञमशिषदवनीसुरम्।।
वृत्तौ चारु न रूपसिद्धि कथनं रूपावतारे पुनः, कौमुद्यादिषु चात्र सूत्रमखिलं नास्त्येव तस्मात्त्वया।
रूपानीतिसमस्तशास्त्रसहितं स्पष्टं मितं प्रक्रिया, सर्वस्वाभिहितं निबन्धनमिदं कार्यं मदुक्ताध्वना।। सं. व्या. चरि., पृ.सं. 57

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

6) केषाञ्चित् विदुषां मतानुसारमयं नारायणभट्टः कोच्चिन् वीरकेलराज्ञः (क्री.1601-1615 अथवा यम्.इ. 776-690) समकाले प्रशस्तिग्रन्थानरचयदिति, अम्पलपूलराज्ञां(क्री.1566-1622) समकाले अष्टमीचम्पुः बिम्बलीशप्रशस्तिः चारचयदिति ज्ञायते।

7) मानमेयोदयः इति ग्रन्थे कालिकट् राज्याधीशस्य मानवेदस्य प्रस्तावो दृश्यते।[13] तथैव राजा जमेरिन्(1655-58) आश्रये अयं मानमेयोदस्य मेयभागः ग्रथितवानिति ज्ञायते।[14] तस्मादयं नारायणभट्टः प्रायः क्रीष्टाब्दस्य 1655 वर्षस्य पूर्ववर्तीत्युच्यते। एवञ्च नारायणभट्टः वासुदेवविजयकाव्यम्, भृङ्गसन्देशः इत्यनयोः लेखकस्य वासुदेवकवेः समकालिकश्चेति मन्यते।

8) इदमप्यौचित्यं वरीवर्ति अस्य यत् सिद्धान्तकौमुदी ग्रन्थस्य चरितार्थतां सम्पादनाय भट्टोजिदीक्षितः नारायणभट्टस्य पाण्डित्यं विज्ञाय तं द्रष्टुकामो केरलराज्यं प्रति प्रस्थितो मार्गमध्ये नारायणभट्टस्य दिवङ्गतत्वं विज्ञाय प्रतिनिवृत्तवानिति ज्ञायते।[15]

---

13 His Skt. Lit., kerala culture & Translation, pg. no. 21

14 K.Kunjunni Raja, The contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit Literature; pg. no.119-152

15 डा. जि. गङ्गाधरन् नायर्, सं.व्या.चरि. पृ.सं. 59

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

अतः अयं भट्टोजिदीक्षितस्य समकालिकः इत्यप्यनुमीयते। तथैव चायं सुदीर्घं शताधिकवर्षाणि यावत् जीवनं यापितवान् इति च ज्ञायते।

एवं पूर्वोक्तानां प्रमाणानामनुसारं दक्षिणदेशीयो प्रसिद्धवैय्याकरणपण्डितोऽयं नारायणभट्टः क्रीष्टाब्दस्य 1560 - 1666 मध्यकालिकः, केरलदेशस्य निलानदीसमीपस्थ उपरिनवग्रामवासी मातृदत्तस्य तनयः इति निर्विवादमुपस्थाप्यते।

नारायणभट्टस्य कृतयः

नारायणभट्टः प्रायः चत्वारिंशत्यधिकान् ग्रन्थान् विलिख्य दक्षिणदेशीयशास्त्रपण्डितेष्वग्रगण्यो समभवदिति कथने नास्ति संशीतिलेशः।[16] अस्य नारयाणीयम्, श्रीपादसप्ततिः, श्रीगुरुवायूपुरेशस्तोत्रम् इति भगवद्भक्तिस्तोत्रकाव्यानि अत्यन्तं प्रसिद्धानि। रामायण-महाभारत-भागवतादीनाम् इतिवृत्तमादृत्य रचितानि चम्पूकाव्यान्यपि लोकप्रसिद्धानि। एवञ्च संस्कृतभाषायाम् अत्यन्तोत्कृष्टाः प्रक्रियासर्वस्वम्, अपाणिनीयप्रामाण्यसाधनम्, मानमेयोदयः, आश्वलायानक्रियाकर्मः, चतुरङ्गाष्टकम्, धातुकाव्यम्, सूक्तिश्लोकः शास्त्रग्रन्थाः काव्यानि च अनेनैव

---

[16] K.Kunjunni Raja, The contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit Literature; pg. no. 164

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

रचिताः। तथैव मातामहिंसाप्रशस्तिः, शैलाब्धीश्वरप्रशस्तिः, बिम्बलीशप्रशस्तिः, मातराजप्रशस्तिः, देवनारायणप्रशस्तिः इत्यादयः प्रशस्तिग्रन्थेषु प्रसिद्धाः।[17] एवं नारायणभट्टस्य सम्पूर्णां रचनावलीं प्रसिद्धसाहित्यविचारको डा. वि. आर्. मुरलीधरन् महोदयः *1. काव्यम् 2. शास्त्रम् 3. शास्त्रकाव्य्* इति त्रिधा विभज्य कथितवान्।[18] किञ्च स्वरूपदृष्ट्या पञ्चधा विभक्तुं शक्यते। यथा –

1. स्तोत्रम् 2. काव्यम् 3. शास्त्रम्

4. शास्त्रकाव्यम् 5. प्रशस्तिः इति।

अतः तदनुगुणमेव नारायणभट्टस्य ग्रन्थानां संक्षेपपरिचयः -

स्तोत्रग्रन्थाः -

1. नारायणीयम्

नारायणभट्टस्य कृतिषु अत्युन्नतं स्थानं नारायणीयमेव भजते। सप्तविंशतितमे वयसि श्रीमद्भागवतकथामुपवर्णयन् नारायणीयाख्यमिदं स्तोत्रकाव्यं निबबन्ध सः। काव्येऽस्मिन् षट्त्रिंशत्युत्तरैकसहस्रमितश्लोकाः (1036) भिन्नेषु वृत्तेषु निगदिताः।

---

[17] K.Kunjunni Raja, The contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit Literature; pg. no. 119-152

18 Contribution of Melputtur Narayana bhatta to Sanskrit Liteature, डा.वि. आर् मुरलीधरन् महोदयः, महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी) - पञ्चमं कुसुमम्, पृ.सं. 40-51

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

कथादृशा अस्मिन् श्रीमद्भागवतकथा माधुर्येण दर्शयतो नारायणभट्टः गुरुवायूरुपुरेशमेवास्मरत्। शतदशकेषु नारायणः वातरोगविमुक्तये भगवन्तं प्रार्थयामास।[19] प्रत्येकस्य दशकान्ते, काव्यान्ते च *"आयुरारोग्यसौख्यम्"* इति भगवतः प्रार्थना एवात्र प्रमाणम्।

2. श्रीगुरुवायूरुपुरेशस्तोत्रकाव्यम्

नारायणभट्टः गुरुवायूरुपुरेशस्य श्रीकृष्णस्य वैभवं प्राधान्येन वर्णयन् श्रीगुरुवायूपुरेशस्तोत्रकाव्यं व्यरचयत्।[20]

3. श्रीपादसप्ततिः

शार्दूलविक्रीडितवृत्तौ सप्ततिपद्येषु श्रीपादसप्ततिः विरचितः। केरले मुक्तिस्थल(मुक्कोल) इत्याख्यस्य प्रदेशस्य श्रीदुर्गादेव्याः आराधनमेवास्मिन् विहितमस्ति। ग्रन्थोऽयं कवेः अन्त्यावस्थायां लिखितमिति ज्ञायते।[21]

नारायणभट्टस्यैव अन्ये चन्दनक्कावु, गणपति, अम्बलप्पुला, एत्तुमनूर, वैक्कमदेवस्य नाम्ना स्तोत्रग्रन्थाश्च श्रूयन्ते।[22]

चम्पूकाव्यानि

---

19 महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी) - पञ्चमं कुसुमम, पृ.सं. 55

20 महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी) - पञ्चमं कुसुमम, पृ.सं. 44

21 His. Skt. Lit., kerala culture & Translation, pg. no. 21

22 महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी) - पञ्चमं कुसुमम, पृ.सं. 44

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

नारायणभट्टः रामायण-महाभारत-भागवत-शिवपुराणसम्बद्धानि विंशत्यधिकानि चम्पूकाव्यान्यररचत्।[23]

रामायणकथावस्तु आधारीकृत्य 4) निरनुनासिका (निरनुनासकिप्रबन्धः)[24], 5) शूर्पणखाप्रलापः, 6) राक्षसोत्पत्तिः, 7) अहल्यामोक्षः, 8) बालकाण्डम् इत्यादीनि,

महाभारतकथामादृत्य 9) महाभारतचम्पूकाव्यम्, 10) राजसूयः, 11) दूतवाक्यम्(कृष्णदूतः), 12) युधिष्ठिराभिषेकम्, 13) सुभद्राधनञ्जयम्, 14) द्रौपदीपरिणयः, 16) पाञ्चालीस्वयंवरम् इत्यादीनि,

शैवपुराणमुपलक्ष्य 17) पार्वतीस्वयंवरम्, 18) दक्षयज्ञः, 19) कैलासशैलवर्णनम्, 20) त्रिपुरादहनम् इत्यादीनि,

तथैव *भागवतमादृत्य* 21) मत्स्यावतारः, 22) कुचेलावृत्तम्, 23) गजेन्द्रमोक्षः, 24) श्यमन्तकः, 25) नृगमोक्षः इत्यादीनि, *कल्पितोतिवृत्तौ* 23) अष्टमीचम्पूः 26) स्वाहासुधाकरः, 27) कोटिविरहः, 28) गोष्टीनगरवर्णनचम्पूः चेत्यादीनि चम्पूकाव्यानि ग्रथितानि।[25]

23His. Skt. Lit., kerala culture & Translation, pg. no. 20-21

24 अनुनासिकरहितानि व्यतन्देतानि पद्यगद्यानि।

नारायाणाभिधानो द्विजापोतो रविनटेश्वरदेशात्।। महस्विनी, पञ्चमं कुसुमम्, पृ.सं. 51

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

एतेषु चम्पूकाव्येषु महाभारतचम्पूकाव्यमसम्पूर्णमस्तीति ज्ञायते। तथैव रामायणे नासिकच्छेदनात् रावणस्य भगिन्या शूर्पणखया काव्यान्तं यावत् अनुच्चारितानां नासिकाक्षराणां त्यागः प्रशंसनीयः। कालान्तरे एषा प्रक्रिया सर्वासु भाषास्वपि व्याप्ता। यथा तेलुगुभाषायां निरोष्ठ्यरामायणम्। अन्यस्मिन् राजसूयः इति चम्पूकाव्ये युधिष्ठिरेण समाचरितस्य यागानुष्ठानविधेः प्रस्तुतिः, कवेः मीमांसाशास्त्रप्रतिभा अत्यन्तमतिशेते। एवञ्च पाञ्चाली स्वयंवरम्, राजसूयः चेत्यनयोः व्याकरणशास्त्रस्यसाङ्केतिकांशाश्च स्फुटयन्ते।[26] तथैव अष्टमीचम्पूः स्वाहासुधाकरः[27], कोटिविरहः[28] इत्येतौ शृङ्गाररचनायाम् अन्तर्मुक्तौ आस्ताम्।

---

[25] 1) Krishnamachariar, His. Clas. Skt. lit., Mahakavya, pg. no.175,
2) सं. व्या. चरि., पृ.सं. 57, तथैव 3) His. Skt. Lit., Kerala culture & Translation, pg. no. 21

26 महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी) - पञ्चमं कुसुमम्, पृ.सं. 44

27 रविरयमस्तं यातः समाशमो हन्त हन्त चन्द्रोदयम्।
याति विकासमपीयं कुमुद्वती किं विलम्बसे भृङ्ग।। (स्वाहासुधाकरः - 8) का. मा. 4 गुच्छकम्

28 कामिनी कामुकं प्राह यामिनी कामुकानना।
यताप्रायमिदं दिनं कमलिनी दीनेयामालोक्यताम्।।
नीरन्ध्रश्च पयोधरः स च शशी दूरेऽधुना वर्तते।
विप्रागारमिदं तटाकसविधे स्वायत्तमेतच्छते।।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

यथा-

स्वाहासुधाकरे –

रविरयमस्तं यातः समाशमो हन्त हन्त चन्द्रोदयम्।
याति विकासमपीयं कुमद्वती किं विलम्बसे भृङ्ग।।[29] इति।

कोटिविरहे -

कामिनी कामुकं प्राह यामिनी कामुकानना
यातप्रायमिदं दिनं कमलिनी दीनेयमालोक्यताम्
नीरन्द्रश्च पयोधरः स च शशी दूरेऽधुना वर्तते।
विप्रागारमिदं तटाकसविधे स्वायत्तमेतच्छते
गेहं तत्क्षतपय क्षपामिह महान् कार्यातिपातो न चेत्।।[30]
इति।

एवं संस्कृतसाहित्ये विद्यमानेषु चम्पूकाव्येषु नारायणभट्टस्यैव अधिकसंख्याकाः चम्पूग्रन्थाः विलसन्ति इति विदुषामभिप्रायः।[31] तेष्वपि अधिकचम्पूकाव्यग्रन्थाः देवालयेषु

गेहं तत्क्षतपय क्षपामिह महान् कार्यातिपातो न चेत्।। (कोटिविरहः) का. मा. 5 गुच्छकम्

[29] His. Skt. lit., pg. no. 189 (Prof. A Ramulu)

[30] His. Skt. lit., pg. no. 189 (Prof. A Ramulu)

31 विश्वनाथः, सा.दर्प. 6.336

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

उपन्यासप्रबोधार्थं *कुट्टञ्चेरि नटेश्वर रविः* इत्यादि स्वमित्रगणाय लिखिताः एव इति विद्वद्वराः प्रस्तुवन्ति।[32]

शास्त्रग्रन्थाः

व्याकरण-मीमांसा-तन्त्रादि शास्त्रेषु निष्णातो नारायणभट्टः शास्त्रीयदृष्ट्या नैखान् ग्रन्थान् लिलेख। नारायणीयमित्यादि स्तोत्रकाव्यानामिव शास्त्रग्रन्थानामपि तावत् महद्वैशिष्ट्यं विद्योतते। येषु ग्रन्थेषु व्याकरणशास्त्रादीनामतिविस्तृता चर्चा शास्त्रजिज्ञासुनां कृते उपलभ्यते। तद्यथा - 29) प्रक्रियासर्वस्वम्, 30) अपाणिनीयप्रामाण्यसाधनम्, 31) मानमेयोदयः, 32) चतुरङ्गाष्टकम्, 32) सर्वमतसङ्ग्रहः, 34) निबन्धनसर्वमतसङ्ग्रहः इत्यादीनां सर्वेषां सङ्क्षेपेण परिचयश्च क्रियते यथा -

29) प्रक्रियासर्वस्वम्

शास्त्रग्रन्थेषु नारायणभट्टस्य प्रक्रियासर्वस्वम् व्याकरण शास्त्रग्रन्थेषु समुन्नतं स्थानमलङ्करोति। अम्बरनदीश देशमहाराजा देवनारायणस्य आदेशादेव दशाब्दादिभिः असम्पूर्णतया त्यक्तमिदं केवलं षड्सु दिवसेष्वेव समापितम्।[33] अस्मिन् प्रतिपदं भाषायाः वैज्ञानिकतायाश्च वैशिष्ट्यमुपपादितम्। यथा संज्ञा, परिभाषा, सन्धिः, कृत्तध्दितादि विंशतिविभागानां प्रस्तुतिः -

---

32 महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी) - पञ्चमं कुसुमम्, पृ.सं. 44

33 डा. जि. गङ्गाधरन् नायर्, सं. व्या. चरि., पृ.सं. 56-57

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

इह संज्ञा परिभाषा च सन्धि कृत्तद्धित समासाश्च।
स्त्रीप्रत्ययाः सुबर्थाः सुपां विधिश्चात्मनेपदविभागः।।
तिङपि च लार्थविशेषाः सनन्तयङ्यङ्लुकश्च सुब्धातुः।
न्यायो धातुरुणादिश्छान्दसमिति सन्तु विंशति खण्डाः।।[34]

इति।

नारायणभट्टः कात्यायन-पतञ्जलिश्चेत्यनयोः पन्थानमनुसरन् पश्चात् विरचितानां व्याकरणशास्त्रग्रन्थानां साहाय्येन यथावसरं कृष्णसम्बद्धानि उदाहरणानि अस्मिन् ग्रन्थे उपन्यस्यति। यथा -

रासविलासविलोलं भजत मुरारेर्मनोरमं रूपम्।
प्रकृतिषु यत् प्रत्ययवत् प्रत्येकं गोपिकासु सम्मिलितम्।।
अभितः केशवं गोपाः गावस्तं परितः स्थिताः।
समया तं स्थिता राधा निकषा तां सखीजना।।
हा कृष्णमिति शोचामि कृष्णो मां प्रतिभासताम्।[35] इति।

एवं व्याकरणशास्त्रग्रन्थेष्विवात्र पाणिनीयसूत्राणां व्याख्या सम्यक् प्रतिभाति। धर्मकृतेः *रूपावतारः* एवं रामचन्द्रस्य *प्रक्रियाकौमुदी* इत्येताभ्यां सह अस्य विशिष्टसम्बन्धः संलक्ष्यते।

30) अपाणिनीयप्रामाण्यसाधनम्

---

34 प्र. सर्व., प्रस्तावना

35 डा. जि. गङ्गाधरन् नायर्, सं. व्या. चरि., पृ.सं. 58

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

भवभूतिः, मुरारीत्यादीनां साहित्यकप्रयोगेषु ये लोके रूढाः विद्यन्ते, ते व्याकरणशास्त्रदृष्ट्या असाधवः इति अर्वाचीनानां चान्द्र-भोजव्याकरणकाराणां मतमासीत्।[36] तन्निराकर्तुं नारायणभट्टः संस्कृतव्याकरणशास्त्रे पाणिनिमहर्षिम् अनुसृत्य चोलराज्यस्य यज्ञनारायण, सोमेश्वर, सुदर्शन, वैनतेयादि प्रसिद्धानां वैयाकरणानां मतमुट्टङ्कयन् मुनित्रयसिद्धन्तानां विरोधः न कल्पनीयः इति, प्रमाणपुरस्सरं विचारयति। यथा –

सुदर्शनसमालम्बि सोऽहं नारायणोऽधुना।
वैनतेय भवत्पक्षमाक्रम्य स्थातुमारभे।।[37] इति।

ग्रन्थारम्भे च वदत्येवम् -

पाणिन्युक्तं प्रमाणं न तु पुनरपरं चन्द्र भोजादिसूत्रं
केऽप्याहुर्यल्लघिष्टं न खलु बहुविदामस्ति निर्मूलवाक्यम्।
बह्वङ्गीकारभेदो भवति गुणवशात् पाणिनेः प्राक्कथं वा
पूर्वोक्तं पाणिनिश्चाप्यनुवदति विरोधेऽपि कल्प्यो विकल्पः[38]
इति।

31) मानमेयोदयः

---

36 डा. जि. गङ्गाधरन् नायर्, सं. व्या. चरि., पृ.सं. 59

37 महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी) - पञ्चमं कुसुमम्, पृ.सं. 50

38 डा. जि. गङ्गाधरन् नायर्, सं. व्या. चरि., पृ.सं. 59

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

ग्रन्थोऽयं पूर्वमीमांसायाः भाट्टसिद्धान्तस्य प्राथमिकज्ञाननिरूपकः अस्ति। अयं मान-मेय इति द्वेधा प्रस्तूयते। प्रथमो मानभागस्य कर्ता नारायणभट्टः। प्रथमे भागे नारायणभट्टः भाट्टसिद्धान्तपक्षस्य सविमर्शं जिज्ञासोत्पादकं चर्चामकरोत्। मीमांसाशास्त्रे अस्य विशिष्टं स्थानमस्तीति विदुषामभिप्रायः।[39]

32) चतुरङ्गाष्टकम्

नारायणभट्टरचितेषु चतुरङ्गाष्टकम् इत्ययं विलक्षणः शास्त्रग्रन्थः अस्ति। अस्मिन् भारतीयानां मेधोत्कर्षकात्मक चतुरङ्गक्रीडायाः सलक्षणं जयापजयार्थं स्वीकरणीयानां सोपानानां विवेचनं सर्वरञ्जकं द्योतते। विश्वे चतुरङ्गक्रीडायाः अत्यन्तप्राचीनो आकरः ग्रन्थः अयमेवेति उद्घोष्यते।[40]

33) सर्वमतसङ्ग्रहः 34) निबन्धनसर्वमतसङ्ग्रहश्च

नारायणभट्टः पूर्व-सिद्धान्तपक्षस्य च औचित्यं विशदीकरणार्थं सर्वमतसङ्ग्रहः निबन्धनसर्वमतसङ्ग्रहश्चेति ग्रन्तद्वयम् अलेखीत्। अनयोः कुमारिलभट्टस्य तन्त्रवार्तिकस्य विश्लेषणं उपलभ्यते। अतः भारतीयवाङ्मये एतौ द्वौ ग्रन्थौ

---

39 महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी) - पञ्चमं कुसुमम्, पृ.सं. 45

40 महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी) - पञ्चमं कुसुमम्, पृ.सं. 46

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

तत्वशास्त्रप्रबोधकाविति विचारः। केचन पण्डिताः अनयोः द्वयोः नारायणभट्टस्य कृतित्वे सन्दिग्धतां प्रकटीचक्रुः।[41]

शास्त्रकाव्यानि

लोके प्रायः मनुष्यानां मनोभिरुचौ भगवद्भक्तिरेव मुक्तिप्रापकमिति विश्वासः। अतोऽयं भगवतः चरितकथनेन सह ईप्सितशास्त्रस्य विचारार्थं भट्टिकवेः रावणवधसदृशं 35) धातुकाव्यम्, 36) सूक्तश्लोकः, 37) आश्वलायनगृह्यक्रियाकर्मश्च रचयामास। तेषां परिचयो सङ्क्षेपेण यथा -

35) धातुकाव्यम्

संस्कृतशास्त्रकाव्यवाङ्मये धातुकाव्यम् विशिष्टतममस्ति। भागवतपुराणस्य कंसवधेतिवृत्तमुपलक्ष्य माधवीयधातुवृत्त्यनुसारं द्विसहस्रधातवः लक्ष्यमुखेन त्रिषु सर्गेष्वेव सुन्दरशैल्या प्रयुज्य काव्यमिदं प्रणायि। शब्दोत्कर्षात्मकमिदं शास्त्रकाव्येषु रामणीयकं वासुदेवविजयम् इत्यस्य समापकमस्ति।

36) सूक्तश्लोकः

शास्त्रकाव्यग्रन्थेषु विशिष्टशैल्या सूक्तश्लोकः ग्रन्थः रचितः अस्ति। ऋग्वेदे निर्दिष्टाध्यायानाम् अष्टकादि क्रमानुसारं कटपयादि नियमानुसारं यमकशैल्या स्रग्धरावृत्तौ नवश्लोकेषु देव्याः स्तुत्या

41 महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी) - पञ्चमं कुसुमम, पृ.सं. 46

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

ग्रन्थोऽयं विरचितः। वैदिकसाहित्यस्यौचित्यं कवेः प्रतिभा चास्मिन् दृश्यते।

37) आश्वलायनगृह्यक्रियाकर्म

काव्यमाध्यमेन वैदिककर्मानुष्ठाने रुचिं प्रकटयितुं नारायणभट्टः आश्वलायनगुह्यक्रियाकर्म इति शास्त्रकाव्यमलिखत्। अस्मिन् ऋग्वेदीययागानुष्ठानविधौ आश्वलायनशाखायाः परिकल्पनाः तात्विकदृष्ट्या प्रतिपाद्यन्ते।[42]

प्रशस्तिग्रन्थाः

नारायणभट्टः क्रीस्तोः परम् 1566-1656 मध्यकाले केरलदेशस्य केम्पकेसरी देवनारयणः, मानवेदः, जमेरिन् इत्यादीनामाश्रये शास्त्र-काव्य-चम्पूग्रन्थानतिरिच्य स्तुत्यात्मक ग्रन्थानेवातिशयेन अलिखत्। तेन लिखितेषु स्तोत्रग्रन्थेषु सर्वेषु प्रायः भगवतः प्रशस्तिरेव प्राधान्येनातिशेते। अतः ते प्रशस्तिग्रन्थाः इति परिकीर्त्यन्ते। तद्यथा –

38) गोश्रीनगरीवर्णनम्, 39) मातामहिंसाप्रशस्तिः,
40) बिम्बलीशप्रशस्तिः, 41) मातराजप्रशस्तिः,
42) अम्बरनदीशप्रशस्तिः, 43) देवनारायणप्रशस्तिः,
44) वीरकेरलप्रशस्तिः, 45) शैलाब्धीश्वरप्रशस्तिः,

42 महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी) - पञ्चमं कुसुमम्, पृ.सं. 46

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

46) मानविक्रमप्रशस्तिः इत्यादयः लोकप्रसिद्धाः।[43] इति।

नारायणभट्टस्य पुत्रः कविपण्डितः श्रीकृष्णः च ताराशशाङ्कम्, भ्रमरीमौर्वमौर्वीकम्, इक्षुचापम्, पुष्पबाणमित्यादीनलिखदिति ज्ञायते।[44]

नारायणभट्टस्य रचनाशैल्याः गुणात्मकनिष्कर्षः

स्तोत्र-चम्पूकाव्य-शास्त्र-शास्त्रकाव्य-प्रशस्तिश्चेति बहुप्रकार-कानां ग्रन्थानामाधारेण नारायणभट्टः भक्तिकामुकः सर्वदा देवतानां स्तवनशीलो इति ज्ञायते। यतो हि भक्ति-वेदान्तादि पन्थानमनुसरतो कर्मापेक्षया भक्तिमार्गः एव सरलः मोक्षप्रापकश्चेति दृढं विश्वस्य स्वग्रन्थनरचनाप्रवृत्तिम् आश्रितवानिति। ज्ञायते यथा -

निष्कामं नियतस्वधर्माचरणं यत्कर्मयोभिधम्
तद्दूरेत्यफलं यदौपनिषस्तदज्ञनोपलभ्यं पुनः।
तत्वव्यक्तयत्यौ दुर्गामातरं चित्तस्य तस्माविभौ
त्वत्प्रेमात्मकभक्तिरिव सततं स्वदीयसि श्रेयसी।।[45] इति।

एवं नारायणभट्टस्य ग्रन्थानां गुणात्मकविश्लेषणं यदि क्रियते तर्हि नारायणभट्टस्य गुणा एवं प्रकारेण आविष्कर्तुं शक्यन्ते। यथा

1. भक्तिविषयक वर्णनापटुः।

---

43 महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी) - पञ्चमं कुसुमम्, पृ.सं. 47

44 ताराशशाङ्कम् (उपोद्घातः), का. मा. 4 गुच्छकम्

45 महस्विनी(षाण्मासिकी) - पञ्चमं कुसुमम्, पृ.सं. 50

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

2. पौराणिकविषयेषु विद्वद्वरेण्यः।

3. बौद्धिकविचारे नूतनत्वम्।

4. भावविनिमये समर्थः कविः।

5. कथेतिवृत्तौ रसालङ्कारयोः प्रयोगे पारङ्गता।[46]

6. वर्णनेषु रूचिपूर्णता माधुर्यता च।

7. विधिपूर्वकं शब्दानां यथारीत्या सन्निधाने निरूपणे च स्वक्षमता।

8. शब्दप्राचुर्यं च स्वविचारस्थापनम्।

एवं विचारेण नारायणभट्टः तस्य ग्रन्थाश्च प्रायः सर्वे अनुसरणात्मकाः अवर्तन्त। तच्च श्लोकादस्मात् ज्ञायते यत् -

न किञ्चिदत्र स्वकपोलकल्पितं
लिखामि शास्त्रे क्वचिदीक्षितं विना।
अनेकथा यत्र पुराविदां मतं
मनोहरं तत्र परं ग्रहिष्यते।।

संक्षोपातिशयेऽपि वाच्यबहुताहेतोरभूद्विस्तरः।
स्पष्टत्वेऽपि च स्वभावगहना भागा मनागस्फुटाः।।
एवं व्यक्तिमियान् पदार्थ इयता ग्रन्थेन यातोऽयमि।

---

46 रासविलासविलोलं भजत सुरारेर्मनोरमं रूपम्।
प्रकृतिषु यत् प्रत्ययवत् प्रत्येकं गोपिकासु सम्मिलितम्।। प्र. सर्व. प्रस्तावना, पृ. स. 4

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

इत्येवं या विमृशेत् स एव कलयेदस्मिन् निबन्धे गुणान्।।

इति।

*****

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

INTRODUCTION

The *Apayiniyaprāmanya-sadhanam* was described under the title Parapekşakhandanam in the Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Curator's Office Library, Trivandrum (1939), No. 475. Through an article under the caption Oru kattu (A Letter) in the issue of the *Mathrubhumi* weekly, Calicut, dated 5-2-1939, the late pandit E.V. Räman Nampütiri brought to the notice of the public the last portion of the work which is in the form of a covering letter addressed to the scholars of the Cola country in general, and one Somesvara Dikşit and Yajñanärāyana Dikşita in particular. Subsequently in 1942 the same scholar brought out an edition of the work with the name *Apăniyapramanata* which was printed in Devanāgari script in the V.V Press Branch, Trivandrum. It is curious to note that as per the information given on the title page of this edition only 54 copies were printed. The present edition is based on this printed edition (designated R in the foot-notes) and an old transcript of the manuscript described in the Trivandrum Catalogue (designated as Tc in the foot-notes) which was made available to me by Sri M.S.K. Nampūtiri.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

The author of this *krodapatra* is the well-known versatile scholar *Melputtur Nārāyaṇa Bhattatiri* who flourished between 1560 and 1666 A.D.[47] Thus, he was a contemporary of the renowned scholars of Coladesa, like the celebrated Appayya Dikşita, Venkatesa Makhin and Räjacüdāmani Dikşita, although there seems to be no full knowledge of the works of Bhaṭṭatiri in Coladesa and the works of the Cola scholars in Kerala at that time.

The *krodapatra* is a reply to the dogmatic views of one Vainateya who held that the grammatical works other than of the trinity of sages, namely, Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patanjali were not authoritative. In the grammatical work *Prakriyäsarvasva* Narayaṇa Bhaṭṭatiri has accepted the authority of the grammars of non-Paninian school. Particularly Bhoja, the author of the *Sarasvatikanthābharaa* and *Sringaraprakasa* was held by him in high esteem and he has even copied some sections of the *Sarasvatikanthabharana* in his own grammatical work (e.g. the *Nyayakhada* in the Prakriyāsarvasva.),

One may imagine that seeing the *Prakriyāsarrasva*, the Vainateya Pandita in question might have challenged the acceptance of non-Paninian views by Bhaṭṭatiri; but there is yet no support to this

[47] K.K. Raja: The Contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit Literature, p. 130

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

imagination. If we could unearth some work which avowedly denies the authenticity of non-Paninian works, we may be able to understand the situation under which Närāyana Bhaṭṭatiri wrote this *krodapatra*. The work is unique in the sense that there is no other treatise found so far devoting itself to the task of proving the authority of non-Pannian grammars through systematic *argumentation*, although the ideas expressed herein are found scattered in the works of the trinity of Sages, the *Vakyapadiya* and in the works of the grammarians down to *Bhojedeva*. The main idea presented here is that the scope of language is wider and the grammar is only an aid to understand the correctness of usages. Many noted writers have used forms which are not noticed by Panini and his followers. Are we to reject these usages as incorrect because rules for them are not found in the Paninian grammar? Or shall we consider those usages as correct and acceptable even to Panini though not noticed by him? The fanatics would answer the first question the affirmative, and this treatise is a fitting answer to them. Naráyana Bhaṭṭatiri is of course a votary of the Paninian school. He maintains that Paninian rules are the clearest and the briefest of the Sanskrit grammars. But he would not admit that the other grammars are therefore non-authoritative. The grammar is for explaining and codifying the language, whereas

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

language is too wide to be restricted by grammatical rules.

Beginning from *Kaiyyata* upto *Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa*, there has been a tendency to reject the authority of the non-Paninan grammars and to show forcibly that the forms which are not found in the rules of the trinity of the sages can be somehow or other pressed out of their works. In this process even the religion of the authors has been brought to play a part. For example, the incorporation of some rules of *Candragomin* in the *Kasikavritti* was resented by the votaries of the trinity of sages. The author of the *Nyasa* has been criticized sometimes very severely presumably on the ground that he was a Jaina although his work is one of the best in the Paninian system. This narrowness of outlook in the academic matters is what not favoured by Närayana Bhattatiri. Of course, his teacher, the celebrated grammarian and astronomer Acyuta Pişäroṭi had already shown this broad outlook in his éxcellct manual on grammar the *Pravesaka*. Bhattatiri has however given us a well-reasoned treatise vindicating this broad outlook and liberality through this *krodapatra*.

The Vainateya whose views criticised in this *krodapatra* is yet to be identified. Appäkavi or Periyappä Šästri, the author of the Sringāra

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Sahajiyam[48], says that his uncle as well as one of his brothers is Vainateya. Dr. V. Raghavan states that there were several Vainateyas.[49] But until the treatise which has been criticised in this *krodapatra* is known we are unable to identify the Vainateya in question. Appikavi's father Annā Sāstri is said to have been in the court of Venkaṭa patirāya of Vijayanagar.[50] His brother Vainateya is said to have written a commentary on the Prakasa (most probably *Rucidatta's* commentary on the *Tattvacintāmani*).[51] This Vainateya must be then a contemporary of Närāyaṇa Baṭtatiri, but it is not yet known whether he was maintaining the view that the non-Paninian grammars were not authoritative.

The covering letter at the end of the *krodapatra* is addressed to one Someswara Dikşhita and Yajñinārāyana Dikshita, The former is still to be identified while the latter must be the schölār minister. of Raghunatha Nāyaka of Tanjore.[52] It is also mentioned here that the Somesvara Dikshita was a scholar of deep

---

[48] Described under R.No. 1843 in the Madras Government Oriental MSSS Library Catalogues.

[49] See foot-note No. 3 of the translation of the present work.

[50] Vide R.No. 1843 of the Madras Government Oriental MSS. Library Catalogue. According to New Catalogus Catalogorum this was Venkatapati III who ruled from 1632-42

[51] ibid.

[52] The last but one verse of the covering letter indicates this. Nayak ruled between 1614 and 1633.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

èrüditon in Grammar, Mimānsā, Vedanta and Tarka and he wrote a work Kamadeva-vijaya vanquished one Kamadeva. The prologue to the *Sringara Sahajiyam* referred to above mentions that Annan Sāstri vánquished onë Kāmadéva în the court of Venkatapatírāya. Annan Sāstri's öthèr ñamë was *Cidämbara* according to M. Krishnamachary,[53] but his tdentify this Somesvarǎ is still ünknown. Ullur Ş. Parameswata Alyar[54] identifies this Somésvara the author of *Rāghavayädavíyam*[55], but no proof is given to substantiate his statement. The nature of the work *kämadeva-vijaya* is also not known. Was it a treatise on grammar, or *Mimamsa* or *Tarka*?[56] This point is not clear from the reference in this *krodapatra.*

The works of Närayana Bhattatiri deserve to be known more widely. It is hoped that the present edition with the English translation and notes will prove to be useful to the students of Sanskrit in general and of Sanskrit grammar in particular.

****

---

[53] History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, p. 245.

[54] Kerala Sähitya Caritram, vol. IL. p.390.

[55] This author's family name was Vinjimürt. He was a desciple of one Dvivedi. See R.No. 1859 of Madras Govt. Oriental Mss. Library Catalogue.

[56] According to New Catalogus Catalogorum, vol. III. p. 348, it is a grammatical work.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

ओम् श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः

अथ अपाणिनीयप्रामाण्यसाधनम्

सुदर्शनसमालम्बी सोऽहं नारायणोऽधुना।
वैनतेय भवत्पक्षमाक्रम्य स्थातुमारभे।।

तत्रायं सङ्ग्रहः –

पाणिन्युक्तं प्रमाणं न तु पुनरपरं चन्द्रभोजादिशास्त्रम्(सूत्रम्)
केऽप्याहुस्तल्लघिष्ठं न खलु बहुविदामस्ति निर्मूलवाक्यम्।
बह्वङ्गीकारभेदो भवति गुणवशात्, पाणिनेः प्राक् कथं वा ?
पूर्वोक्तं(क्तिं) पाणिनिंश्चाप्यनुवदति, विरोधेऽपि कल्प्यो विकल्प्यः।।

I, the same N a r a y a n a[57], now depending upon *Sudarsana*[58], O! *Vainateya*[59]! Propose to maintain myself having overpowered your paksa[60].

---

[57] i. e. the author of the Prakriyasarvasva (PS) in which the authority of the non-Paninian grammars is admitted.

[58] The word means 'correct view' as well as the divine disc of that name associated with Narayana, Visnu.

[59] This name is yet to be identified. There were several Vainateyas (probably belonging to Tarksya family). See: Dr. V. Raghavan, Introduction to the *Sahendravilasa*, Tanjore Saraswati Mahal Series No. 54, p. 44.

[60] *Paksa* means 'view' or 'opinion' and also the wing, the whole verse is an allusion to the mythical story of *garudagarvobhanga* narrated in the *Udyogaparvan* of the Mahabharata, Canto 105, where Visnu

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
This is the summary [of this treatise]:

Some say that what is said by Panini is authoritative, not the treatises of *Candra*, B h o j a, and others; this is most flimsy; for those who know much do not speak without base; that more people prefer a thing is due to its merits; how was it before Panini? Panini himself quotes what was said by [his] predecessors; even if there be a conflict an option is to be presumed.

1. अत्र तावद् **इन्द्रचन्द्रकाशकृत्स्न्यापिशलिशाकटायनादि-पुरातनाचार्यरचितानां व्याकरणनामप्रमाणत्वमेव, मुनित्रयोक्तस्यैव तु प्रामाण्यम्** इति केचित् पण्डितम्मन्या मन्यन्ते। तदपहसनीय मेव। चन्द्रादिवचसामनाप्तप्रणीतत्वाभावेन प्रामाण्यनिश्चयात्। पुरुषवचसाम् अप्रामाण्यं तावदनाप्तप्रणीतत्वहेतुकमेवेति चन्द्रादि शास्त्राणामप्रामाण्यं वदद्भिस्तेषामनाप्तत्वे प्रमाणं वक्तव्यम्।।

1. Here there are some who, professing themselves to be scholars, think that the grammars composed by the

---

overpowers the celestial bird Garuda and brings him to his knees. The verses 18 and 32 are most Pertinent:

स तस्य वचनं श्रुत्वा खगस्योदर्कदारुणम्।
सङ्क्षोभ्यं क्षोभयंस्तार्क्ष्यमुवाच रथचक्रभृत्।।
एवं विष्णुबलाक्रान्तो गर्वनाशमुपागतः।
गरुडो बलवान् राजन् वैनतेयो महायशाः।।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

ancient teachers like *Indra*[61], *Candra*[62], *Kāsakrtsni*[63], *Āpisali*[64] and *Sākatāyana*[65] are not authoritative; what is said by the trinity of sages alone is authoritative. This is indeed ridiculous; for the words of *Candra* and others are to be deemed as authoritative since they are not spoken by untrustworthy persons. Lack of authority of human words is due to nothing else but their being uttered by an untrustworthy person; so those who speak of the lack of authority for the [grammatical] rules of *Candra* and others will have to show the proof for their untrustworthiness.

---

[61] There is much controversy regarding this grammarian. Some place him before Pânini, while others either bring him down to the Post-Paninian period or identify him with the author of the Kātantra. See Systems of Sanskrit Grammar (SSG) by S.K. Belvalkar, pp. 10 ff.

[62] Candragomin, who flourished, probably, in the fifth century, A.D. His work was made use of by the authors of the Kāšikā (K).

[63] According to the Mahābhāsya (MB) the author is Kāsakrtsni and his work Kāsakrtsnam. Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar (DSG) gives the form Kāśakrtsna alone as the name of the author. The *Ganaratnamahodadhi* has only Kāśakrtsni. The prātipadika kasakrtSna 1s included in the upakādi (Pā. I1. 4. 69) and arīhanadi (Pā. IV. 2. 30) ganas. The Brahmasutras refer to Kāśakrtsna, an author.

[64] A grammarian referred to by Panini in VI. 1. 92, etc.

[65] This is not the ancient teacher known to Pānini, but the Jaina grammarian who wrote the Sākatāyàna-śabdünusāsana and a commentary on it. SSG. p. 68 ff.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

2. तत्र तेषामनाप्तत्वं तावत् प्रत्यक्षतो न लक्ष्यते। **चन्द्रादिवाक्यप्रमाणम्;?** **शिष्टानङ्गीकृतत्वात्, अवैदिकवाक्यवद्** इत्यनुमानमत्र प्रसरीसर्ति इति चेत्; तत्र शिष्टानङ्गीकृतत्वमसिद्धमेव। तथा हि-के नामात्र शिष्टा व्यपदिष्टाः? किं वैदिका एव? उत साधुशब्दव्यवहारिणः? उत ये केचिद् भवदभीष्टा वा?

2. Their untrustworthiness is not known by direct perception. Nor can it be known by the inference 'the words of Candra etc., are not authoritative, because they are not accepted by the righteous, like the non-vedic words', because [the probans] 'non-acceptance by the righteous' is not proved. Who are those that are meant here by the expression] 'the righteous'? Those who are the votaries of the Vedas? Or those who use correct words? Or only those whom you accept to be the righteous?

3. तत्राद्ये तावत्, परमवैदिकानां वेदव्यासादीनां मुनित्रयालक्षितबहुपदप्रयोगदर्शनात्, **दृष्ट्वा बहु व्याकरणं मुनिना भारतं कृतम्** इति चोक्तत्वात् ; शङ्कराचार्याणामपि प्रपञ्चसारादिषु **हुनेद्** इत्यादि मुनित्रयानुक्तपदप्रयोगात् ; वैदिकोत्तमानां च मुरारिमिश्र सुरेश्वराचार्यादीनां **विश्रामादि** शब्दप्रयोगात् ; वैदिकवीरस्य नैषधकारस्य **नैवाल्पमेधसि पटो रुचिमत्त्वमस्य** इत्यादि प्रयोगात्; वैदिकस्थापकानां

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

विद्यारण्याचार्याणां धातुवृत्तौ कथापयति इत्यादौ शाकटायनादि मताङ्गीकारात्; बोप्पदेवकौमुदीकारादीनां च वैदिक वाराणाम् अपाणिनीयानेकशब्दप्रदर्शनदर्शनात्; इदानीमप्युत्तरदेशस्थैर्वैदिकश्रेष्ठैः सारस्वतादिव्याकरणानां प्रमाणीकरणात्; कौमुद्याश्च सर्वदेश परिगृहीतत्वात्; पाणिनीयोत्पत्तेः प्राग्भवैश्च वैदिकैः व्याकरणान्तराणामेवाङ्गीकृतत्वात्; पाणिनीयव्यतिरिक्त च्छान्दसलक्षणानां प्रतिशाख्यानां युष्माभिरप्यङ्गीकृतत्वाच्च व्याकरणान्तराणां शिष्टाङ्गीकृतत्वं स्पष्टतरमेव।।

3. In the first, Instance it is very clear that the righteous have accepted other grammars. For,

a) *Vedavyasa*, etc., who were the super most among the votaries of the Veda have used many words which are not noticed by the trinity of sages; and it is recorded that 'after seeing many a grammar the *Bhärata* was composed by the sage.

b) Sankaracaryä has also used the words *'hunet'*, etc., in his *Prapancasāra* which are not sanctioned by the trinity of sages[66];

[66] The form should be juhuyāt according to Pānini. Prapancasāra (Arthur Avalon, Calcutta 1935), VI. 93, 94, 97. In VI. 91, however, the form juhuyāt is used.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

c) Murārimiśra[67], Sureśvarācārya[68], etc., who were the best among the votaries of the Veda, have used the words, *visrāma*, ctc;

d) The author of the Naişadha, the hero of the followers of the Veda, has used *'naivālpamedhasi pato rucimattvam asya*[69];

e) VidyāraDyācārya who was the re-establisher of the Vedic religion has accepted the view of Šākatāyana,

---

[67] Anargharāghāva: 1, 10. (Also see Meghadūtam, I. 27, where Maliinātha remarks: विश्रामो वा इति चान्द्रव्याकरणविकल्पेन वृद्धिविधानाद् रूपसिद्धिः।)

[68] Apparently the author means Bhavabhūti, whose identity with Sureśvarăcārya" has the blessings of a tradition. See Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya's article in The Indian Historical Qucrterly, vol. VII, pp, 301-8. In PS under Pa. VII.3.62, the author mentions the form as used by Murāri and Bhavabhūti:

विश्रामस्यापशब्दत्वं वृत्युक्तं नाद्रियामहे।

मुरारिभवभूत्यादीनप्रमाणीकरोति कः।।

Sureśvara's works, Naiskarımya-siddhi and the Vārttikas do not have viśrāma. But, if we depend upon the word ādi in višrāmādi we can show non-Paninian usages of Sureśvara. For Example, the word avasitum found in the Brhada-ranyaka-bhāsya-vārttikam, II. 1. 463; IV. 3. 728, etc., is non-Paninian. It must be avasātum as the root so is anit.

[69] Naisadhiyacarita, XIII. 13. The form must be alpamedhe as according to Pa. V. 4. 122 the asic suffix is aded to medhä only when the latter is preceded by nañ, su or dus. The form ha, however, been justiied by resorting to an implication provided by tlhe word nityam in the sutra. See K.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

etc., in respect of the words *kathāpayati*, etc.[70], in the *Dhatuvrtti*;

f) *Boppadeva*[71], the author of the *Kaumudi* and many others who are noted among the votaries of the Veda has used several words which are not accepted by Pānini;

g) Even now the revered followers of the Veda in the Northern, regions regard the *Sarasvata* Grammar,[72] etc., as authoritative;

h) The *Kaumudi*[73] is accepted (for study) in all regions;

i) The votaries of the Veda prior to *Pānini's* birth should have necessarily accepted only other grammars; and

j) you yourself have accepted the *Prātisākhyas* whose rules on Vedic usages are quite different from those given by Pānini.

---

[70] According to Pānini the form is kathayati. PS admits kathāpayati as advocated by Sakatayana. But in Säkatāyana under IV. 2. 100 we find kathayati. Roth and Monier Williams record kathāpayati.

[71] The MSS. of PS have Boppadeva although SSG and DSG have Bopadeva alone. The doubling may be to fecilitate Dravidian pronounciation.

[72] A scribed to Anubhūtisvarūpācārya, though the real author seems to be Narendrācārya. SSG. p. 17.

[73] The Prakriyā-Kaumudi of Rāmacandra.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

4. ननु व्यासाद्यृषिवचसां छान्दसत्वेन सिद्धत्वात् तत्सिद्धये कुतो व्याकरणान्तराङ्गीकारः? **दृष्ट्वा बहु व्याकरणम्** इत्यस्य च **एकमेव व्याकरणं बहुशो दृष्ट्वा** इत्यर्थः इति चेत्, तन्न ; मुनित्रयानुक्तच्छान्दस पदसमर्थनार्थं छान्दसलक्षणतयापि व्याकरणान्तराणां तैरादरणीयत्वात् ; **बहु व्याकरणम्** इत्यस्य क्लिष्टार्थकल्पनानुपपत्तेः।।

4. [Objection:] the usages of the sages like *Vyāsa* are valid as Vedic usages; so where is the need for other grammars to establish their validity. The phrase 'after seeing many grammars' can be taken to mean 'after seeing the same grammar for many times'[74].
[Answer:] In order to justify the vedic usages which are not mentioned by the trinity of sages, they (Vyāsa, etc.) should have resorted to other grammars at least for the rules of Vedic words. It is also not proper to assume such a stretched meaning for the expression *'drstvā bahu vyakaranam.*

5. ननु **व्यत्ययो बहुलम्, बहुलं छन्दसि, सर्वे विधयश्छन्दसि विकल्प्यन्ते** इति सूत्रवार्तिकवचनादेव सिद्धेः व्याकरणान्तरं नान्वेष्यामिति चेत्, तर्हि एतैरेव वचनैः कृतार्थौ पाणिनि-कात्यायनौ छान्दसविषयशेषग्रन्थि

---

[74] i.e., Taking bahu as an adverb.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

कत्थायां किमर्थं परिक्लिष्टौ? तस्माद् व्यासाद्युक्तावपि विशेषलक्षण व्याकरणान्तरं लभ्यमेव।।

5. [Objection:] Now in the *Sutrās* and *Vārttikas* we find such statements as: "Deviation of these rules is found in many cases (in the Vedic language)[75] In the Vedic language the rules vary (in many ways)[76]; All rules are to be understood as optional with regard to the Vedic language[77]; so there is no necessity of the search for another grammar.

[Answer:] This is not correct; because if this be the case, why should Pāṇini and Kātyāyana instead of being satisfied with these statements exert themselves to expatiate the remaining portion related to the language? Therefore even for the usages of Vyāsa, etc., other grammars of special rules can be found.

6. न च प्रातिशाख्यलभ्यामिति वाच्यम् ; तेषामपि व्याकरणान्तरत्वेन भवदुक्तविरोधित्वात्। ननु प्रातिशाख्यान्य-साधारणव्याकरणान्येव, साधारण-व्याकरणान्तराणामेव च प्रामाण्यमस्माकमनिष्टम् इति चेत्, न।

---

[75] Pa. III. 1. 85.

[76] ibid. V. 2. 122; VI. 1. 34; VIL. 1. 8; VII. 1. 103; VII. 3. 97 and VII. 4. 78.

[77] MB on Pā. I. 4. 9: योगविभागः कर्तव्यः। वा छान्दसि सर्वे विधयो भवन्ति।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
अपाणिनीयत्वसाम्येऽपि असाधारणव्याकरणानामिष्टत्वे साधारणेषु विद्वेषे च निमित्ताभावात्। पाणिनीयस्य नियमपरत्वात् तत्सदृशेष्वन्येषु प्रद्वेष इति तु पश्चान्निकारिष्यति। यत्तु **अपशब्दास्त्रयो माघे** इत्यारभ्य **व्यासस्तन्मयतां गतः** इति, तदपि गुरुलघ्वोः **ग,ल,**शब्दोक्तिवत् नामैकदेशेन नामग्रहणाद् अपशब्दा इति अपाणिनीयशब्दा इति व्याचक्षते महान्तः।

उक्तं च –

अष्टादश पुराणानि नव व्याकरणानि च।

निर्मथ्य चतुरो वेदान् मुनिना भारतं कृतम्।। इति।

यान्युज्जहार भगवान् व्यासो व्याकरणाम्बुधेः।

तानि किं पदरत्नानि भान्ति पाणिनिगोष्पदे।।

इति च।

6. It cannot be said that those usages can be obtained from the *Pratisākhyas*: for they are also other grammars and so it is against your own words.

[Objection:] The *Prātisākhyas* are special grammars; what we do not favour is the authority of other general grammars.

[Answer:] There is no reason why one should like the special grammars but dislike the general grammars when both are equal in being other than the grammar of Panini. The point that because of the restrictive

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

nature of the rules of Panini there is dislike for other grammars similar to that of Pāṇini will be refuted elsewhere [in this treatise].[78]

[The verse] that begins with 'there are three ungrammatical words in the Magha' [and ends in] Vyāsa has become one with them' (i.e., the ungrammatical words)[79] is interpreted by eminent [scholars] taking the word *apasabda* as standing for *apāniniyasabda* by [the method of uttering a part of the name instead of the whole name,[80] just like [the words] 'ga' and la' (standing) for guru and laghu [respectively, in the works of prosody]. It is also stated: After churning the eighteen Puranas, nine grammars and the four Vedas, the Bhārata was composed by the sage.[81] Further, Could those gems of words, which the venerable Vyāsa took out of the ocean of grammar, be measured in the small puddle of Pānini?[82]

---

[78] See: Paragraphs 13 and 14.

[79] The source is to be traced.

[80] MB on Pā I. 1. 45 (Vartika 3) पदेषु पदैकदेशान्। देवदत्तो दत्तः सत्यभामा भामेति।

[81] The source is to be traced.

[82] Devabodha commentator on the *Maha* bhārata has another versions:

यान्युज्जहार माहेन्द्राद् व्यासो व्याकरणार्णवात्।

शब्दरत्नानि किं तानि सन्ति पाणिनिगोष्पदे।।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

7. ननु छान्दसानामच्छान्दसत्वेन प्रयोगादेव व्यासस्य व्याकरणानाभियुक्तत्वमिति चेत्, मैवं सर्वज्ञं व्यासं प्रत्यमङ्गलं वोचः। एवं च पाणिनेरपि व्याकरणानभियुक्तत्वं स्यादिति स्वगलच्छेदकमेवेदं भवतो वचनम्। सोऽपि हि **वृद्धिरादैच्** इति कुत्वाभावं छान्दसमेव प्रयुक्तवानिति **कुत्वं कस्मान्न भवति** इत्यादिना भाष्यजालेन भाष्यत इत्यास्तां तावत्।।

7. (If you say) Vyâsa is [to be regarded] not versed in grammar for the same reason of using Vedic words as non-Vedic words, (my reply is) please do not utter such an ominous word against the omniscient Vyāsa.
This statement amounts to cutting your own throat, since (according to this) Pānini will also have to be deemed as not versed in grammar; for he has used *Vrdhir adaic* where the absence of kutva[83] is Vedic as has been pointed out by the eleborate *Bhāsya* beginning with 'why there is no kutvam here.[84] So let this [argument] be closed.

8. एतेन **साधुशब्दव्यवहारित्वं शिष्टत्वम्** इति च निरस्तम्। किञ्च शिष्टव्यवहृतानामेव साधुत्वम्, साधुशब्दव्यवहारिणामेव शिष्टत्वम्, इति परस्पराश्रयोऽपि प्रसज्यते। शिष्टप्रयुक्तानामेव साधुत्वमिति च व्याकरणमीमांसामविवादमिति।।

---

[83] According to Pa.VIII.2.30.*c* at the end of a word is to be replaced by *k*
[84] On Pa. I.1.1

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

8. By this [the contention that] the righteous are those who use correct words is also set aside. Moreover the [defect of] interdependence [in this argument] is also to the point: The words which are used by the righteous are alone correct and only those who use correct words are the righteous. That the words used by the righteous alone are correct is undisputed in the science of grammar.[85]

9. एवं तृतीयपक्षोऽपि म्रदीयान्। मुनित्रयमतमात्राङ्गीकारिण एव शिष्टा इत्यत्र श्रुतिस्मृतिवचनाभावेन भवत्कपोलमात्रकल्पितत्वात्। मुनित्रय वचनस्यैव प्रामाण्यात् तदङ्गीकारिणामेव शिष्टत्वमिति चेत्, कर्हिचित् प्रामाण्यवशात् तदङ्गीकारिणां शिष्टत्वं शिष्टाङ्गीकृतत्वाच्च प्रामाण्यम् इत्यन्योन्याश्रयलाभ एव धन्यात्मनाम्। अथ ये केचिदेव भवदभीष्टाः शिष्टा इति चेत्, ये केचिदस्मदभीष्टा इति दुर्युक्तियुक्त एवायं वादकलहः स्यात्। तदिदमुक्तम् – **न खलु बहुविदामस्ति निर्मूलवाक्यम्** इति। बहुविदां व्यासशङ्करादीनां निर्मूलपदप्रयोगाभावात् तन्मूलतया व्याकरणान्तराणां तैरङ्गीकृतत्वात्, शिष्टानङ्गीकृतत्व-हेतुरसिद्ध एवेति भावः।।

9. In this way the third view is also frail. Only those who have accepted the views of the trinity of sages are the righteous' is not said by any sruti or smrti; it is only

[85] MB on Pa. I. 3. 1. (Vā. 13); स चावश्यं शिष्टप्रयोग उपास्यः।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
your presumption. If it is contended that since the words of the trinity of sages alone are authoritative, only those who accept them are the righteous, your Blessed Self will have nothing but the benefit of incurring the [defect of] interdependence [in the argument], namely, because the words are authoritative those who accept them become the righteous, and the words are authoritative because they are accepted by the righteous. If [it is the idea that] the righteous are only those whom you have favoured to be so, then, they could as well be only those who are favoured by us to be so]; and this debate will only prove to be an irrational strife. This is what is meant by 'those who know much do not speak without base'. This means that as Vyāsa, Sankara and others, who know many things would not use words without a base, they should have accepted other grammars as the source of their usages; thus the probans 'being accepted by the righteous' is proved.

10. शब्दश्च वैदिको वा मन्वादिकथितो वा न व्याकरणान्तराणामप्रमाण्यबोधको दृश्यते। न च मुनित्रयवचनं तदनुसारि ग्रन्थारं वा पुनरितरप्रामाण्यप्रतिपक्षेपकं साक्षादीक्षामहे।।

10. No verbal testimony of the Vedas or Manu and the like is available showing the lack of authority of other grammars. Nor do we find any direct statement by the

trinity of sages or any other work of their followers to repudiate the authority of other grammars.

11. यत्तु क्वचिद् विश्रामादीनामयुक्तत्वभाषणं तल्लक्षणान्तरदर्शनेन प्रयोक्तव्यमित्येतावत्परम्। अन्यथा सर्वदैव मुनित्रयवचननिबद्धादराणां मुरार्यादीनां तत्प्रयोगानुपपत्तेः।।

11. The statement (found in some places) that the usages like *visrāma* are not proper[86], really means that such words are to be used according to the rules found in other grammars. Otherwise, Murāri and others, who have always held the words of the trinity of sages in high reverence, could not have made such usages.

12. किञ्च मुनित्रयतदनुसारिवचसां प्रमाण्यातिशये सिद्ध एव तैरन्यशास्त्राणां बाधः, अन्यशास्त्राणामेतद्बाध्यत्वेन दौर्बल्यातिशये सिद्ध एव च एतद्वचसां प्रामाण्यातिशयसिद्धिः, इत्यन्योन्याश्रयेणैव हन्यन्ते महान्तः। मुनित्रयवचनादेव मुनित्रयवचनप्राबल्यसिद्धिरिति स्वाश्रयमपिप्रसक्तमेव।।

12. Moreover, Your Honour is beaten by the inter-dependence [of your own arguments], for, only when the extra authority of the words of the trinity of sages

---

[86] K. VII. 3. 34 सूर्यविश्रामा भूमिरित्येवमादिकं प्रयोगमन्याय्यमेव मन्यन्ते; also see f.n. 12. supra.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
and its followers is established. they can rule out the treatises of others, and only when the extra weakness of the other treatises is established as a result of their being ruled out, the extra authority of the words of the former can be proved. Besides, this would amount to say that the extra strength of the words of the trinity of sages is proved only on the strength of the words of the trinity of sages; thus [the defect of] self dependence is also to the point.

13. न च **पञ्च पञ्चनखा भक्ष्याः** इतिवत् मुनित्रयवचनेन **एत एव साधुशब्दाः** इति नियमितत्वादन्येषामप्रामाण्यमिति वाच्यम्। **आबादयः प्रयोगत अनुसर्तव्याः** इत्यादि तत्र तत्र वर्णनाद् आकृतिगणादिपरिग्रहाच्च नियमाभावस्य स्पष्टत्वात्। अन्यथा पाणिनिकात्यायनाभ्याम् **एथ एव साधवः** इति नियमनाद् भाष्यकारकृतेष्ट्यादिवचनमप्रमाणं स्यात्। पाणिनिनिय-मितत्वाद् वा कात्यायनवचनान्यपि बाध्येरन्। **ननु** पतञ्जलेः सर्वोत्कृष्टत्वात् कथं तद्वचनबाध इति चेत्। तर्हि व्यासादेरपि सर्वोत्कृष्टत्वात् तद्वचनबाधाभावाय व्याकरणान्तरमपि प्राप्तम्। (पाठान्तरम् - ननु पतञ्जलेः सर्वोत्कृष्टत्वात् तद्वचनबाधाभावाय व्याकरणान्तरमपि (प्राप्तम्) बाध्यम्।) मुनित्रयवचनस्य नियमपरत्वे छान्दससूत्रैरेत एव साधुशब्दा इति नियमितत्वात् प्रातिशख्यान्यपि प्रत्याख्येयानि स्युः।।

In Public domain, Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

13. It cannot be said that just as in the case of the statement 'five clawed are to be eaten'[87] the words of the trinity of sages are restrictive that 'only these words are correct', and so others are not authoritative; for, the absence of such a restriction is evident from the statements made very often that "the [sufixes] äp, etc., are to be followed according to the usage[88], as well as from the acceptance of *akrtiganas*. Otherwise, as Pänini and katyāyana have already restricted that 'these words alone are correct', the emendations of the author of the *Bhäsya* would have no authority. The statements of Kātyāyana would also be ruled out by Panini's restrictive rules. Because *Patanjali* is the best of all (i.e., the three sages) how can his words be annulled?

(Answer ;) In that case because *Vyasa*, etc., are also the best among all, in order to avoid the annulment of their words other grammars (than those of the trinity of sages) are also to be anticipated. (Because Patanjali is the most revered [among the three] in order to avoid the nullification of his words other grammars have also to be ruled out. If the words of the three sages are taken as restrictive, since their rules dealing with the Vedic language have determined the correct usages, the *Pratisakhyas* will also have to be repudiated.

---

[87] Manusmrti, V. 17, 18.

[88] MB on Pā, IV. 1. 3; Padamaijarī on Pā. IV. 1. 1.

विचित्रा हि शब्दानां शक्तयो यथादर्शनमुपगन्तव्याः ।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

14. ननु मुनित्रयवचने वेदविशेषलक्षणानिरीक्षणात् सामान्यलक्षणपराणि व्याकरणान्तराण्येव तेन व्यावर्त्यन्ते, न वेदविशेषलक्षणपराणि प्रातिशाख्यानि इति चेत्, न। **सम्बुद्धौ शाकल्यस्येतावनार्षे, यजुष्युरः, देवसुम्नयोर्यजुषि काठके, सामस्विकः, प्लुतपूर्वस्य सर्वदीर्घबाधनार्थं यणादेशो वक्तव्यः** इत्यादि वेदविशेषलक्षणानामपि स्पष्टदृष्टत्वात्। न च **दृष्टानुविधिश्छन्दसि भवति** इति वचनात् छान्दसेषु न नियमः प्रवर्तत इति वाच्यम्। शास्त्रसाकल्यस्य नियमपरत्वे तदन्तर्गते छान्दसे,,पि नियमस्य दुर्वारत्वात्। **शिष्टप्रयोगानुसारि व्याकरणम्** इति तत्र तत्र दर्शनेन लौकिकेष्वपि शिष्टानुविधिसाम्याच्च। तस्मादाकृतिगणादिभिः सावशेषे शास्त्रे **एतेषामेव शब्दानां प्रयोगे धर्मो भवति** इति नियन्तुमशक्यत्वाद् **एतत्प्रकारकाणां साधुशब्दानां प्रयोगे धर्मः, तदितरापशब्दप्रयोगे त्वधर्मः** इत्येतावदेव नियमपरत्वं वक्तव्यम्।।

14. [Objection:] Since no special rules regarding the Vedic language are noticed in the works of 'the three sages, only the grammars dealing with the general rules are ruled out by them, not the *Pratisākhyas* which deal with the special rules regarding the Vedic language.

[Answer:] This argument cannot hold. For even the special rules regarding the Vedic language are clearly seen in the rules (of the three sages) such as '[The sound] o belonging to the vocative singular (is

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

pragrhya) when followed by a non-vedic iti'[89], In the *Yajus* the word uras ending in o will not get euphonic change when followed by a', [90] 'The (words) deva and sumna [will get a for their last phoneme] in the *Käthaka-yajus'*[91], *sāmasvikalh*,[92] '[A vowel] preceded by a *pluta* will be replaced by *yan* in order to prevent its elongation',[93] etc. It is not to be said that the restriction does not operate with regard to the Vedic usages because of the statement 'for the Vedic (language) the rules are to be presumed in accordance with the usages found[94]; for when the grammar in its entirety is recognized to be restrictive, it is hardly possible to exclude the restrictive nature of the *vedic* portion which is also included in it. The rules regarding the classical language also equally follow the correct usage of the righteous; for again and again one finds the statement that the grammar closely follows the usage of the righteous.[95] Therefore in a grammar which is evidently not exhaustive due to the concept of] *ākrtigana*, etc., it is impossible to have a restriction that 'the usage of these words alone bring in

[89] Pa, I. 1. 16.

[90] ibid. VI. 1. 117.

[91] ibid. VII. 4. 38.

[92] This rule could not be traced.

[93] Va. on Pa. VI. 1. 77 यणादेशः प्लुतपूर्वस्य च दीर्घशाकलप्रतिषेधार्थम्।

[94] MB on Pa. I. 1. 6, Vā. 1: दुष्टानुविधित्वाच्च छन्दसः।

[95] See f. n. 29 supra.

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
the unseen merit'. The restriction could only be that 'a merit will emerge by the usage of words similar to those which are derived here; and a demerit by the usage of words other than these'.[96]

15. अत एव तद्धितप्रकरणे **शिष्टप्रयोगतोऽनुगन्तव्यम्** इत्यस्मिन्नर्थे वृत्तिकारेणोक्ते पदमञ्जरीकृदाह – **किमर्थं तर्हि व्याकरणमिति चेद् उच्यते। व्याकरणोक्तान् शब्दान् विदित्वा तत्सम्यग्व्यवहारिणः पुरुषान् दृष्ट्वा शिष्टा एत इत्यवगम्य तत्प्रयुक्तमन्यदपि ग्राह्यतया ज्ञातुं शिष्टपरिज्ञानार्थं व्याकरणम्** इति। अतो नियमपरत्वं परास्तम्।।

15. That is why in the context of *taddhita* when the author of the *Vrti* made a statement to the effect that (the correctness of words is to be determined) by following the usage of the righteous,'[97] the author of the *Padamanjari* said:
[If it be asked] what is then the grammar for, the answer is this: After knowing the [correct] words given in the grammar and noticing the persons who use them in the right way, one understands that 'these persons are the righteous'. This leads to the knowledge that their usages other than those [found in the grammar] are also to be accepted. So the grammar is for

---

[96] MB. Vol.I. p. 8. Vā. 1: लोकतो,,र्थप्रयुक्ते शब्दप्रयोगे शास्त्रेण धर्मनियमः Vākyapadiya, I.140
[97] K.VI.3.109

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

recognizing the righteous'.[98] Therefore [the contention that the grammatical rules are restrictive is set aside.

16. किं चात्र भाष्यादिगिरा तदुक्तेः प्राबल्यमित्येवमुदीर्यते चेत्। ततो मदुक्तत्ववशान्मदुक्तिः प्रमाणमित्येव वचो लघीयः।।

16. Further, if it is maintained that the words of those (i.e., the three sages) are powerful because of the statement of *Bhaṣya*, etc., then it would be easier to say 'my word is authoritative because it is said by me'.

17. तत् सिद्धम् अपौरुषेयः पौरुषेयो वा शब्दो न व्याकरणान्तराणामप्रामाण्यं बोधयतीति। तदिदमुक्तम् – **न खलु बहुविदामस्ति निर्मूलवाक्यम्** इति। बहुविदां भाष्यकारादीनां निर्मूलं शास्त्रान्तराप्रामाण्यकथनं स्ववचनप्राबल्यवचनं वा स्वाश्रयाभिभवान्न सम्भवतीति भावः। अत्र क्वचित् परशास्त्रदूषणमस्ति चेदपि युक्तिरसमात्रेणैव इत्यवगन्तव्यम्। किञ्च **असिद्धवदत्राभाद्** इत्यादि परश्शतानि सूत्राणि भाष्यनिरस्तान्यपि न त्यज्यन्ते। तद्व वस्तुपरं शास्त्रमिति।।

17. Thus it is proved that there is no verbal testimony either superhuman or human teaching the non authority of other grammars. This is what is meant by

---

[98] The quotation is not here verbal. Also see MB on Pā.VI.3.109

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
"those who know much do not speak without base'. The sense is that the author of the *Bhāṣya*, etc., who know much would not make a baseless statement amounting to the non-authority of other grammars and the authority of their own words, because it (such a statement) is vitiated by self-dependence. Even if there be, in certain cases an adverse criticism of other grammars, it is only for the pleasure of reasoning. Further, more than a hundred of aphorisms like 'here up to the end of the rules referring to the name *bham* [the rules are] as if they have not operated',[99] though nullified by the *Bhäsya* have not been discarded. So the science of grammar is objective.

18. ननु बह्वङ्गीकारान्यथानुपपत्त्या मुनित्रयवचसामेव प्रामाण्यम्, अन्यशास्त्राणामप्रमाण्यमपि सिद्धम् इत्यर्थापत्तिरेवात्र प्रमाणमिति चेत्, तदपि न। सुग्रहत्वपरि-मितत्वादिगुणातिशयवशादेव बह्वङ्गीकार विशेषणस्योपपत्तेः। तद्वशादन्येषामप्रमाण्यस्य साधयितुम-शक्यत्वात्। अन्यथा तर्कग्रन्थेषु मणिरेव बह्वङ्गीकृत इति कुसुमाञ्जलिकिरणावलि पक्षिलभाष्यादीनि अप्रमाणानि भवेयुः। शब्दशास्त्रे,,पि कैयटटीका बह्वङ्गीकृतेति भर्तृहरिटीकाद्यप्रमाणं स्यात्। स्मृतिष्वपि मानवादीनां पुराणेष्वपि भागवतादीनां शिक्षासु च शौनकीयादीनां बह्वङ्गीकृतत्वाद्

[99] Pā VI 4. 22.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

इतरेषामप्रामाण्यं वदन् भवानवैदिकतम-श्चापद्येत। पाणिनीयानां तु गुणातिशयो,,स्माकमिष्ट एव। इतरेषामप्राण्यमेव त्वनिष्टम्। एतेन मीमांसादिषु व्याख्यानाय पणिनीयमेव गृहीतमिति तस्यैव प्रामाण्यमित्येतदपि निरस्तम्। गुणवत्त्वात् प्रसिद्धतया मीमांसादौ तदुपादानोपपत्तेः। तेनान्येषामप्रामाण्यकल्पनानवकाशात्। तदिदमुक्तम् – **बहङ्गीकारभेदो भवति गुणवशाद्** इति।

18. [Objection:] The authority of the words of the three sages alone and the non-authority of other-grammars are proved by [the means of} Presumption, as otherwise the acceptance of the former alone by the majority [of scholars] could not be well accounted for.

[Answer:] This is not correct. The acceptance by the majority can be accounted for by the reason of [their] having the special merits of clarity, brevity, etc. Because of this it is impossible to prove the non-authority of others. Otherwise, because among the works on Logic, *Mani*[100] alone is accepted by the majority, the works like *Kusumañjali*[101], *Kiranävali*[102], the *Bhasya* of Pakşila[103], etc., would be non-authoritative. In the field of grammar also for the reason that *Kaiyata's* gloss has been accepted by

---

[100] *Tattvacintāmani* of Gangesopādhyāya.

[101] An independent work of Udayana.

[102] Commentary on the *Prasastapāda-bhāsya* by Udayana

[103] Otherwise known as Vātsāyana.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
many the glosses of Bhartrhari, etc., should be non-authoritative. Similarly because among the moral codes that of *Manu*, among the Puranas the Bhāgavata, and among the Sikşas that which belongs to *Saunaka* are accepted by many, other works [in these fields] would be non-authoritative; and saying so you would become the foremost among those who do not follow the Vedas. That the works of Paninian school have special merit is acceptable to us also. What is not acceptable is only the non-authority of others. By this the argument that the grammar of Panini alone is authoritative because it is the one that has been accepted in interpreting the *Mimansa*[104], etc., is also refuted. It is quite reasonable that it is accepted in the Mimāmsa, etc., because it is well known for its merits. By this there is no room for presuming non- authority for others. This is what is meant by [the statement 'that more people prefer a thing is due to its merits'.

19. किञ्च एवंवादिना पाणिनेः प्राक् कथं शब्दव्यवहारवार्ता इति वक्तव्यम्। न हि तदा साधुशब्दव्यवहार एव नास्तीति युक्तम्। ऊहादिसाधुत्वाभावेन सकलधर्मानुष्ठान-विप्लवप्रसङ्गाद्, अपशब्दप्रयोग कृतसर्वनरकपातप्रसङ्गात्, सर्वेषां म्लेच्छताप्रसङ्गाच्च। न च तदा व्याकरणं

---

104 Sabara in commenting on the *Mimāsā-Sutras* and Kumārila on Sabara's Bhāsya, etc.

विनैव साधुशब्दान् जानन्तीति वाच्यम्। **ब्राह्मणेन निष्कारणः षडङ्गो वेदोऽध्येयो ज्ञेयश्च** इति श्रुतिवचनात्, तदानीं षडङ्गाध्यय-नाभावेन सर्वेषामब्राह्मणत्वप्रसङ्गात्। न च पञ्चाङ्गान्येव तदानीमध्येयानीति वा पाणिनीयस्यै-वाङ्गत्वमिति वा वचनमस्ति। भाष्यकारोऽपि **तस्मादध्येयं व्याकरणम्** इत्येव मुहुर्मुहुराह, न त्वध्येयं पाणिनीयमिति। तस्मात् पाणिनीयोत्पत्तेः पूर्वं पूर्वव्याकरणानामेव बहङ्गीकारात् तदन्यथानुपपत्तिजं प्रामाण्यं तेषामप्यनिवार्यम्।।

19. Moreover, he who argues as shown above will have to say how the correct usage of words existed before Paṇini. It can never be said that there was no usage of correct words at that time; for [in that case], as there could be no correctness [of usages] through *uha*, etc., there Would have been confusion in the performance of all rituals;[105] all would have also gone to hell by the usage of incorrect words;[106] all would have also become barbarous.[107] It cannot be maintained that at that time people knew the correct words without a grammar; for there is the injunction of the *sruti* that 'ä *brahmana* should study and understand the Veda including its six auxiliaries without any motive',[108] and

[105] See: MB, Vol.I, p.1. where *uha* is one of the purpose of the study of grammar.

[106] Ibid. p.2. under *dustah sabdaah 'yas tu prayunkte'*.

[107] Ibid. म्लेच्छा मा भूमेत्यध्येयं व्याकरणम्।

[108] Ibid. p.1.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
(if there were no grammar) due to the non-study of the six auxiliaries in their entirety all should be non-brähmanas. Nor there is any statement to the effect that at that time only five auxiliaries were to be studied, or that the work of Pänini alone is the auxiliary (of the Veda). What the author of the *Bhäşya* too, repeatedly says is: 'therefore grammar is to be studied[109], not 'Paninian grammar is to be studied'. Therefore, because prior to the Paninian grammar other grammars alone were accepted by many, their authority arising from such acceptance, which is otherwise inexplicable, cannot be prevented.

20. किञ्च पूर्वं तावत् पूर्वशास्त्राण्येव बहङ्गीकृतानि सम्प्रत्यपि सम्प्रथन्ते, पाणिनीयं तु इदानीमेव बहङ्गीकृतम्, पूर्वं न प्रावर्तत, इति बहङ्गीकारविशेषणप्रामाण्यसाधने तेषामेव वैशिष्ट्यं स्यात्।।

20. Moreover, if we prove the authority of something for the reason of its being accepted by many, the works prior to Pänini would become superior for the simple fact that formerly those works alone were accepted by many and are wide-spread even now, but the work of Panini is accepted by many only now because it was not available in older times.

---

[109] ibid. pp. 1-4: more than ten tines:"तस्मादध्येयं व्याकरणम्।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

21. ननु प्रमाणचराण्यपि पूर्वशास्त्राणि पाणिनीयोत्पत्तेः परस्तात् परास्तप्रामाण्यमसृणान्यप्यभूवन् इति चेत्, मैवम्।

कथं प्रमाणभूतानां कालात् प्रामाण्यनिह्नवः।
श्रुतिस्मृत्यादयोऽप्येवमप्रमाणाः स्युरेकदा।।

अत एव हि **कृते तु मानवो धर्मः** इति केनचित् साक्षादुक्तमप्यनादृत्य कलियुगेऽपि मनुवचनं प्रमाणीक्रियते। अतो न कालवशात् प्रामाण्यक्षयः गुणभेदादङ्गीकराभेद एव तु भवति इति। तदिदमुक्तम् – **पाणिनेः प्राक् कथं वा** इति।।

21. [Objection:] Although the older works were previously authoritative, after the advent of the work of Pāṇini their authority faded away.

[Answer:] This cannot be so. How could the authoritativeness of those which were once authoritative be obliterated by the efflux of time? If it could be, even *Sruti* and *Smrti*, etc., might lose their authority at some time. That is why not caring for the open statement by somebody that the dharma instructed by Manu (prevails)[110] but in the *Krtayuga'*, in the Kaliyuga too. the words of Manu are cited as authority. So authority does not fade away by the efflux of time. There can indeed be a variation in acceptance due to the variation in merit. This is what is meant by how was it before Pānini'.

---

[110] Parākara-smti, I. 24.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

22. एवमप्रामाण्यहेत्वभावे सिद्धे न खलु बहुविदामस्ति निर्मूलवाक्यम् इत्यनेनैव शास्त्रान्तराणां प्रामाण्यं साध्यम्। चन्द्रादिवाक्यं प्रमाणम्, समूलवाक्यत्वात्, पाणिनीयवत्; समूलं च तद्वाक्यम्, बहुविद्वाक्यत्वात्, तद्वदेव; बहुविदश्च ते, शास्त्रकारित्वात्, पाणिनिवदेव ।।

22. In this way when the lack of reason for the non-authority (of the non-Paninian works) is established, the authority of those works is to be established by [the reasoning] 'those who know much do not say without base'. [That is to say] the words of Candra and others are authoritative, because they are words having some basis, like those of Pänini'; "their words have some basis because they are the words of those who know much, just like those (of Pāṇini); 'they do know much because they are the authors of the scientific treatises just like Pāṇini'.

23. न हि बहुविधं वक्तव्यजातं सम्यगजानन् शास्त्रं कर्तुमारभते। आरभमाणे,,पि वा परिहासास्पदं स्यात्। तस्मात् शास्त्रकारत्वेन प्रसिद्धानां तेषामपि शब्दतत्त्वविस्तरवेदित्वात्, भ्रान्तिविप्रलम्भकत्वशङ्कायाश्च पाणिनिवदेव तेषामपि निरवकाशत्वात्, सावकाशत्वे वा पाणिनेरपि तच्छङ्काया दुर्वारत्वाद्, आप्तप्रणीतत्वहेतुना व्याकरणान्तराण्यपि प्रमाणानीति सिद्धम्।।

In Public domain, Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

23. Without knowing many sides of what is to be said nobody would attempt to write a scientific treatise. And even if somebody attempts, he would become a victim of redicule. Therefore, for the reasons that even those (non-Paninian) authors renowned for their scientific treatises must be knowing the extension of the science of language, and that there is no room to suspect them of mistake or deception and if there be, such a suspicion could hardly be ruled out in respect of Panini also, it is evident that the other (non-Paninian) grammars are also authoritative because of their being written by trustworthy persons.

24. ननु पाणिनीयगतज्ञापकादिनैव शिष्टप्रयोगाणां साधयितुं शक्यत्वाद् व्याकरणान्तराणां वैफल्यादेवाप्रमाणत्वं ब्रूम इति चेत्, तदपि न। क्वचित् प्रयोगाल्लक्षणकल्पना, क्वचिल्लक्षणात् प्रयोगकल्पनमिति पाणिनीय पातिव्रत्यजुषामप्यविवादम्। तत्र शिष्टप्रयोगे दृष्टे ज्ञापकादिनैव साध्यत्वं नाम। यत्र तु **कथापयति** इत्यादौ व्याकरणान्तरलक्षणमेव दृष्टं, तत्र कथमस्य गतार्थत्वकृतमप्रमाण्यमापद्यते ? अपि च, शिष्टप्रयोगदृष्टि-स्थलेऽपि **विश्रामादौ** व्याकरणान्तरसाक्षाल्लक्षणस्य स्पष्टदृष्टत्वात् क्लिष्टतरज्ञापकादिवर्णनं गौरवायेति प्राप्तेऽपि प्रौढिकामैर्मुनित्रयपूजनार्थं तदीयज्ञापकादिनैव साध्यते चेदस्माकमप्यभीष्टतरमेव। न तु तेन व्याकरणान्तराणां गतार्थत्वमप्रामाण्यं वा इत्यास्तामेतत्।।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
24. [Objection:] We say that the other grammars have no authority because they do not serve any purpose in as much as the usages of the righteous can be vindicated by [the method of] implications, etc., found in the work of Panini.

[Answer] This is also not so. For, in certain instances seeing the usage the rules are to be assumed while in certain (other) instances seeing the rules the usage is to be assumed - this much is undisputed even by those who follow Pänini's grammar fidelity. As such when a usage is found accepted by the righteous it is with avowed to be explained by implication, etc. But in the instance of *kathapayati*, etc., where the rule (for the usage) is found only in other grammars[111], how could there be non-authority [of other grammars] on the ground that they have no purpose to serve. Moreover, even in the case of the usages visrāma, etc., accepted by the righteous, the relevant rules are clearly found in other grammars. Therefore the assumption of implications, etc., by force, becomes cumbersome. In spite of this [fact] with a desire to display one's self confidence and an intention to paying one's respects to the three sages, if such usages are vindicated by resort to implications, etc., we only welcome it. But this cannot mean that the other grammars do not serve any purpose or wield any authority. Let us stop this here.

---

[111] i.e., that of Sākaṭāyana.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

25. किञ्च पूर्वाचार्याणां प्रामाण्यं पाणिन्यादीनामप्यनुमतमेव। आङि चापः, औङ आपः इत्यादौ पूर्वाचार्यमतसाक्षात्संज्ञाया एवोपात्तत्वात्। **व्योर्लघुप्रयत्नतरः शाकटायनस्य, वा सुप्यापिशलेः, वष्टि भागुरिरल्लोपमवाप्योरुपसर्गयोः** इत्यादौ पूर्वाचार्यमतस्य साक्षादुपादानाच्च। न हि पूर्वाचार्यसङ्कीर्तन-मात्राद् विकल्प उत्तिष्ठति। तन्मतमेवं मम मतमेवमिति तन्मतोपादानादेव विकल्पसिद्धिः। किञ्च **तदशिष्यं संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात्, लुब्योगाप्रख्यानात्** इति पूर्वाचार्योक्तं पाणिनिः स्वयमेव दूषयित्वा पुनः **जनपदे लुप्** इत्यादीनि दूषितचराण्येव पूर्वाचार्यवचनानि स्पष्टमुपादत्ते। तेन ज्ञायते क्वचित् युक्तिरसाद् दूषणे कथिते,,पि पूर्वाचार्यवचनमु-पादेयमेवेति।।

25. Further, the authority of the ancient teachers is acceptable to Panini and others. For example, in the rules *'ani capah'*,[112] *auna apah*[113] etc., the technical names accepted by the ancient teachers are directly maintained. In [the rules "According to *Sakatāyana* (the sounds) va and ya may be pronounced with less stress'[114], According to Apisali [the rule is] optional when a nominal verb follows[115], Bhaguri desires an

---

[112] Pa. VII. 3. 105. an is the name for the instrumental' singular according to the pre-Paninian grammars.

[113] ibid. VII. 1. 18. aun stands for the dual numberi of both nominative and accusat ive. This samjnā is taken from the ancients.

[114] ibid. VIII, 3 18

[115] ibid. VI. 1. 92.

In Public domain: Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
elision of the a in the prefixes ava and api[116], views of the ancient teachers are also directly expressed. A rule does not become optional by simply mentioning the names of the ancient teachers; only when their view is recognized as 'this is their View and this is mine', the rule could be optional. Moreover, after criticising what is said by the ancient teachers, in the instances 'this (i.e., concord of gender and number) need not be ruled because it has the authority of conventional term'[117], 'elision [need not also be ruled] because of the noncurrency of the etymological meaning'[118], in the rules like 'when meaning the kingdom [these affixes] elide'[119] Pānini clearly accepts the words of the ancient teachers which were once criticised. By this it is understood that even though in certain cases for the sake of the pleasure of reasoning criticisms are offered, the words of the ancient teachers are nevertheless acceptable.

26. एवं पाणिनिना स्वेन दूषितस्यापि सङ्ग्रहात्।

पूर्वाचार्यमतं क्वापि व्याख्यादौ दूष्यते यदि।।

युक्तिप्रौढिरसेनैवत्यवगच्छन्तु कोविदाः।

---

[116] Though this is not found in MB, Rüpuvatāra and Prakriyt-kaumudi See vol I. p. 131 and vol. I, p. 317, respectively.

[117] Pã. I. 2. 53.

[118] ibid. 1. 2. 54.

[119] ibid. IV. 2. 81.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

तावता हेयता नेति ज्ञापयामास पाणिनिः।।

तेन पाणिन्युक्तं प्रमाणमित्यङ्गीकुर्वतापि तदभिमतत्वादेव पूर्वशास्त्राण्यपि प्रमाणमित्यङ्गीकर्तव्यम्। तदिदमुक्तम् – **पूर्वोक्तं पाणिनिश्चाप्यनुवदति** इति।।

26. In this way since Pänini accepts even that which is criticised by him, if elsewhere in the commentaries, etc., the view of the ancient teachers is found criticised, it is only for the pleasure of displaying self-confidence in argumentation. Let this be understood as such by the learned. Pānini has not, therefore, indicated the rejection [of others' words.]

Therefore he who accepts the authority of what is said by Pānini alone has [necessarily] to accept the authority of older texts also because they are accepted by him (Pānini). This is what is meant by 'Pänini also quotes what is said by his predecessors'.

27. किञ्च **अनादिश्चैषा व्याकरणपरम्परा** इत्युक्तत्वात् पूर्वव्याकरणमूलमालोच्य पाणिनिनापि शास्त्रं कृतमिति वक्तव्यम्। **तेन प्रोक्तम्** इत्यत्रैव च **पाणिनीयं शास्त्रम्** इत्युदाह्रियते, न **कृते ग्रन्थे** इत्यत्र। तस्मात् पाणिनिनापि शास्त्रस्य प्रत्याहारविशेषशालित्वेनोक्तत्वमेव ; न कृतत्वम्, इत्यवगम्यते। ततश्चापणिनीयत्वात् पूर्वशास्त्राणामप्रामाण्यं

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
वदता पाणिनीयस्यापि निर्मूलत्वादप्रामाण्यमेवापादितमिति सकलव्याकरणभञ्जनं सञ्जनितं महाशाब्दिकैः।।

27. Moreover, it is said that 'this tradition of grammer is without a beginning'[120]; so it is to be maintained that Pānini wrote his treatise after considering the previous grammars as his source. The example, 'treatise of Pāṇini'[121] is given under the rule enounced by him'[122] and not under (in the meaning of) a book made on [a subject]'[123]. So it is understood that Pānini only enounced the science of grammar with a different type of technical precision and did not himself invent it Therfore, he who says that the previous treatises do not have authority because they are non-Paninian is virtually proving that the treatise of Panini does not have authority because it does not have any source. In this way the demolishment of all grammars is brought about by the great grammarian that you are.

28. ननु पाणिनिः पूर्वशास्त्राणि प्रयोगान्तराणि च दृष्ट्वा तेषु हेयभागमपहाय शास्त्रं कृतवानिति पाणिन्यनुक्तं हेयमेवेति चेत्, न। पाणिन्यनुक्तस्य हेयत्वे वार्तिककीर्तितस्यापि हेयप्रसङ्गात्। न च

---

[120] See Vakyap adiya, I. 142, 145.

[121] MB. vol. I, p. 12: पाणिनिना प्रोक्तं पाणिनीयम्।

[122] Pa. IV. 3. 101. See also K.

[123] ibid IV.3. 116.

In Public domain, Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

सूत्रवार्तिककारयोरसर्ववित्त्वेऽपि भाष्यकारस्तु भगवान् शेष एवेति तस्मिन्नज्ञातृत्वशङ्काभावात् तदनुक्तं हेयमेवेति वाच्यम्। ज्ञातृत्वे,,प्यानन्त्यवशादनुक्तिसम्भवात्। अन्यथा आकृतिगणादीनि कुतस्तेन परिच्छिन्नानि ? इत्यास्तां तावत्।।

28, [Objection:] Because Pānini made his rules after considering the ancient treatises as well as the usages and removing those deserving rejection, what is not said by Pānini is indeed to be rejected. [Answer:] This cannot be. If what is not said by Pänini is to be rejected, it amounts to the rejection of what is explained by the Värttika too. It cannot also be said that although the authors of the Sutras and the Vārtika are not omniscient, there cannot be any doubt about the omniscience of the venerable author of the *Bhasya*, who isverily Sesa himself[124], and what is not said by him is to be rejected; for even though he knows everything, it is possible that he has not said everything because there is no end of the things to be said[125]. Otherwise, why should he determine the *akrıtigana*, etc., this is sufficient for the present.

29. तेनैवमेव वक्तव्यम् –

---

[124] Ananta, the thousand-tounged mythical serpant.

[125] cf. MB. vol. 1, p. 5: अनभ्युपाय एव शब्दानां प्रतिपत्तौ प्रतिपदपाठः - Prakriyā Kaumudi, vol. II, p. 794: आनन्त्यात् सर्वशब्दा हि न शक्यन्ते,,नुशासितम्।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

दृष्ट्वा शास्त्रगणान् प्रयोगसहितान् प्रायेण दाक्षीसुतः

प्रोचे, तस्य तु विच्युतानि कतिचित् कात्यायनः प्रोक्तवान्।

तद्भ्रष्टान्यवदत् पतञ्जलिमुनिस्तेनाप्यनुक्तं क्वचि –

ल्लोकात् प्राक्तनशास्त्रतो,,पि जगदुर्विज्ञाय भोजादयः।।

अतः सिद्धं पाणिनीयमूलभूतत्वात् पूर्वशास्त्राणां प्रामाण्यमनिवार्यमिति। तदप्युक्तम् – **पूर्वोक्तं पाणिनिश्चाप्यनुवदति** इति।।

29. It is, therefore, to be concluded as below: The son of Dākşi[126] explained [the science of grammar] after considering several [previous] treatises along with the usages; those [points] which were left out by him were explained by Katyāyana; the sage Patanjali explained those that were not noticed by Katyayana; and what is not said even by him is explained by Bhoja and others after seeing some of the usages and [also] the ancient treatises.

Therefore it is evident that the authority of the ancient treatises which were the source for Pānini's work cannot be questioned. This is what is meant by Panini also quotes what is said by his predecessors.

---

[126] cf. MB. vol. I, p. 75 : सर्वे सर्वपदादेशा दाक्षीपुत्रस्य पाणिनेः।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

30. नन्वस्तु तावदेवमविरोधस्थले ; पाणिन्यादिवचनविरोधे तु शास्त्रान्तरोक्तं बाध्यमेव ; इति चेत्, न। तेषामपि प्रमाणत्वेनाबाध्यत्वस्य स्थितत्वात्। उदितानुदितहोमवत्, षोडशिग्रहणाग्रहणवच्च विकल्पस्यैव प्रकल्प्यत्वात्। अत एव स्मृतिचन्द्रिकादिषु स्मृतिकारवचनयोर्विरोधे सति द्वयोरपि विकल्पेन ग्राह्यत्वं तत्र तत्रोच्यते।

तत्र तत्र विकल्पार्थं पूर्वाचार्यानुदीरयन्।
मतभेदे द्वयं ग्राह्यं ज्ञापयत्वेव पाणिनिः।।

30. [Objection:] Let it be as said above in the instances where there is no disagreement, but where there is a disagreement [of other works] with what is said by Panini, what is said in other treatises should become nullified.

[Answer:] This is not correct. For, the fact that they cannot be nullified has come to stay on account of their having authority. As in the case of 'the offering of the oblations after the sun rise or before the sunrise[127] and, 'in taking up or not taking up the şodasigraha,[128] here also an alternative alone is to be assumed. That is why in the Smrticandrika[129] and other works, at many places, where a disagrement between the statements

[127] Kausitaki Brāhmana, II. 7. - 16
[128] Maitrāyanīya-samhitā, IV. 7. 6.
[129] The well known work of Devanabhatta.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
by the authors of moral codes is found, both (views) are maintained acceptable as alternatives.

In many places by mentioning the [names of] ancient teachers for the sake of making the rule optional,[130] Pāṇini verily indicates that in case of a difference in views both are to be accepted (as alternatives).

31. न चैकस्यैव शब्दस्य शास्त्रद्वयेन साधुत्वमसाधुत्वं च बोध्यत इति वस्तुतो द्वैरुप्यायोगेन विरोधस्यैव युक्तत्वात् न ग्रहणाग्रहणानुष्ठानवद् विकल्पसम्भव इति वाच्यम्। नहि केनापि शास्त्रेण शास्त्रान्तरोक्तस्यासाधुत्वं बोध्यते। किन्तु लक्षणशिष्टप्रयोगरहिताः शब्दा असाधव इति दिक्प्रदर्शनन्यायेन बोधितं भवतीति नियमपरत्वदूषणावसर एव भाषितम्। किञ्च षोडशिग्रहणमपि शास्त्राभ्यामदृष्टहेतुत्वेन प्रत्यवायहेतुत्वेन च बोधितमिति कथं तत्र श्रुतिशरणानां विकल्पेनापि प्रवृत्तिसिद्धिरिति पृष्टे यः परिहारः स एवात्रापि भविष्यतीति सिद्धं विरोधप्रतिभानेऽपि विकल्पेन ग्रहणमिति। तदिदमुक्तम् – **विरोधे,,पि कल्प्यो विकल्पः** इति।।

31. [Objection:| Because two treatises speak of the correctness and incorrectness for the same word, actually there are no two words; so it is proper [in such cases] to maintain a conflict; and as such there is no

[130] Pa. VIII. 3. 19, etc.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

possibility of an alternative as in the case of 'the taking up or not taking up (of the *şodasigraha*).

[Answer:] This cannot stand. No treatise instructs [us of] the incorrectness of what is said by another treatise. We are only instructed by way of showing the direction that the words which are not accounted for by rules or usages of the righteous are incorrect. This is already said at the time of criticising the view that the (Paninian) rules are restrictive. Moreover, the taking up of or not taking up *şodasi* is also enjoined by the two rules maintaining it to be a cause of either an unseen [merit] or an offence. So, to the question how in this case there could at least be an optional activity for those who resort to *sruti*, there must be an answer; and the same answer will hold good here too. Thus it is proved that even if there be an appearance of conflict, either (alternative) is to be accepted. This is what is meant by 'even in the case of a conflict an alternative is to be assumed'.

32. किञ्च विरोध एव पाणिनीयेतरवचसोर्न सम्भवति। तत्र विधिसूत्रेषु तावद् **एतेभ्य एवायं प्रत्ययो भवति** इत्यादिनियमो न सम्भवति ; अप्राप्ते नियमायोगात्। न च **सर्वं वाक्यं सावधारणम्** इति न्यायेन नियमः शङ्कनीयः। अयोगव्यवच्छेदेनाप्यवधारणसम्भवात्। अन्यथा अप्राप्तविधि नियमविधिद्वयकथाप्युच्छिद्येत। तस्मादप्राप्तविधिषु तावत् परशास्त्रैरधि-

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

कोक्तौ न विरोधः। यत्र तूत्सर्गतः प्राप्तावपवादतया नियमार्थं सूत्रं तत्रापि परैरधिकोक्तौ क्वचिदपवादविषयेऽप्युत्सर्गो भवति इति न्यायादविरोधः।।

32. Further there can be no conflict between the words of Pänini and others. In the informative aphorisms there cannot be any restriction that 'this suffix is added only to these stems; for there can be no restriction with regard to something which is not previously known[131]. Nor can a restriction be presumed on the ground of the maxim 'all statements are emphatic (in their meaning)', for the emphasis is even possible for the exclusion of what is not previously known. Otherwise there would be no room for the two types of rules, informative and restrictive. Therefore in the case of informative rules there can be no conflict with other rules even if they contain something extra. And in the case of an aphorism which is restrictive by way of its being an exception to the general rule, there can be no conflict [with others] even if others say something extra; because there is the [accepted] maxim, 'In some places even in the realm of an exception the general rule can operate?[132].

---

[131] C. F. सिद्धे आरभ्यमाणो नियमाय।

[132] MB on Pa. VIL. 4. 82. (Vā. 2) अनभ्यासविकारेष्वपवादा उत्सर्गान् न बाधन्त इत्येषा परिभाषा कर्तव्या।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

33. न च पाणिनिना न इत्युक्ते परैः अस्ति इत्युच्यमाने विरोधः; ज्ञापकगणनञ्निर्दिष्टान्यनित्यानि इति नञ्निर्दिष्टस्यानित्यत्व-कथनेन परविरोद्धत्वाभावात्। न च भाष्याद्युक्तयुक्तिभिर्विरोध इति वाच्यम् ;

युक्तयो न्यायवाक्योत्था न्यायाश्च ज्ञापकोद्भवाः।

ज्ञापकोक्तास्त्वनित्याश्च न चानित्या विरोधिनः।।

युक्तस्यैव शब्दसिद्धिश्चेद् विप्लुता शब्दसाधुता।

तस्माद् दृढप्रयोगान् वा पूर्वव्याकरणानि वा।।

आलम्ब्यैव हि युक्त्यापि साधयन्ति मनीषिणः।

अत एव हि युक्त्युक्त्या साधने वक्तृचिन्तनम्।।

तस्माच्छब्दाभियुक्तानां युक्त्या द्वेधापि साधने।

समूलत्वाद् द्वयं ग्राह्यमविरोधश्च वर्णितः।।

33. It is not to be maintained that where Pänini says ‘no’ while others 'yes' there will be a conflict; for by [the maxim] ‘those’ [rules] which are conveyed by the method of implication or inclusion in a *gana* or expression of a 'no' are not peremptory'[133], it is stated

[133] See Paribhāşenduśckhara: ज्ञापकसिद्धं न सर्वत्र (125) नञ्घटितमनित्यम् (987), गणकार्यमनित्यम् (96). PS, Nyayakhanda: समासान्तागमसंज्ञाज्ञापकगणनञ् निर्दिष्टायनिन्त्यानि।

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
that what is conveyed by [the expression] 'no' is not peremptory; so it (what is conveyed by 'no') cannot be in conflict with others. Nor can it be said that there can be a conflict with the arguments advanced in the *Bhāṣya*, etc. For,

The arguments are based on the technical maxims and technical maxims are obtained through implications. Those which are conveyed by implications are optional; and those which are optional cannot be conflicting.

If the [correct] words were to be known through reasoning alone their correctness will be thrown into confusion. Therefore the wise prove the [correctness of] words depending upon firm usages and ancient grammars even while reasoning is employed. That is why in maintaining [the correctness of] a word by reasoning, the consideration of the speaker arises.[134]

Therefore when those are enlightened in the language prove a word in two ways by their reasoning; both are to be accepted because both of them have some basis. And the absence of a conflict has already been explained.

34. न च क्वचिद् ज्ञापकं विना,,पि **विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम्** इति साक्षाद् वचनमेव युक्तिः स्यादिति तत्रानित्यत्वाभावाद् विरोध इति वाच्यम्। साक्षाद् वचनेऽपि विधिनिषेधकोट्योरविरोधस्य प्रागुक्तत्वात्। तत्

---

[134] Namely, whether he is trustworthy (äpta) or not.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

सिद्धमविरुद्धत्वात् सर्वव्याकरणानां समप्रामाण्यम्। तदिदमुक्तं विरोधस्यासम्भवद्योतकेन विरोधेऽपि इत्यपि शब्देन।।

34. [Objection:] In certain places even without an implication the reasoning is expressly conveyed as in the case of the aphorism, "When rules of equal force are in conflict with each other, the latter (in the order] is to take effect[135]; and in such cases there will be a conflict as it (i.e., what is expressly conveyed) is not optional.

[Answer:] This is not correct; because even in the case of an express statement, it has been previously pointed out that there is no conflict between the affirmative and negative points. Therefore, all grammars are equally authoritative as they are not in conflict with each other. This is what is meant by the word 'even' in (the phrase) "even if there be a conflict which indicates that there can be no conflict.

35. नन्वस्तु तावदेवं पूर्वव्याकरणानामार्षत्वेन प्रामाण्यम् ; अर्वाचीनभोजबोप्पदेवादिवचनानां तु कथं कथ्यत इति चेत्, तत्रापि न खलु बहुविदामस्ति निर्मूलवाक्यम् इति ब्रूमः। भाष्यादिकथितसकललक्षणानुकथनादिपरिनिश्चतबहुविद्भावा हि

---

[135] Pā, I. 4. 2.

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

भोजादयः शास्त्रान्तरमहाजनप्रयोगादिमूलमालम्ब्यैव शास्त्राणि प्रणीतवन्त इति पाणिनीयवत् तेषामपि प्रामाण्यमेव। त्रिमुनिव्याकरणे उत्तरोत्तरं च प्रमाणमित्यत्रापि बहुवित्त्वमेव उत्तरोत्तरप्रामाण्ये हेतुः। दृष्टहेतुसम्भवेऽदृष्टहेतुकल्पनानुपपत्तेः। तच्च बहुवित्त्वं भोजादीनामपि समानमिति तेषां विशेषादरणीयत्वमेवेति।।

35. [Objection:] Now let it be that the ancient grammars are authoritative because they are the compositions of sages. But how could one speak of the authority for the words of Bhoja, Boppadeva, etc., who belong to the later times.

[Answer:] Even to this (objection) we say 'those who know much do not speak without basis'. Bhoja, etc., who definitely know much because of their interpretation of all the rules found in the *Bhāṣya*, etc., must have composed their treatises depending upon other rules and the usages of competent people; therefore, those (works) also indeed have authority just like the works of Pāṇini and others. In holding that in the grammar of the trinity of sages there is the gradation of authority in the order of sequence, the reason for such gradation should be nothing but 'knowing much more'. For, it is not proper to assume an unseen reason when a seen one is feasible, And such a 'knowing much more' is equally possible with

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
Bhoja and others also. Therefore, they deserve indeed special respect.

36. **न खलु बहुविदाम्** इत्यस्यान्यो,,प्यर्थः। निर्मूलं खलु व्याकरणान्तराप्रमाण्यं बहुविदो न वदेयुः। एतदपेक्षया तावद् बहुविदां विद्यारण्यादीनां तदकथनात्। तस्माद् बहुग्रन्थवेदित्वाभावादेवायं प्रतिवादी निर्लज्जमेव निर्मूलवाक्यं प्रलपतीत्युपहसनीयमेवेति।

पूर्वव्याकरणादि मूलरहितं युक्त्यैव यत् साध्यते
कैश्चित्तत्र मुनित्रयाप्रतिहते हेयत्वमुद्घोष्यते।
अन्येभ्यो गुणवत्तया च बहुभिर्यद् गृह्यते खल्विदं
तस्मात् खल्पयमन्यशास्त्रमखिलं मिथ्येति विभ्राम्यति।।

इति।

36. The clause beginning with 'those who know much' has another meaning also. Those who know much will not make the baseless statement that other grammars are not authoritative. Even Vidyāraṇya, who definitely knows more when compared to these persons have not said so. Therefore only due to lack of acquaintance with many treatises this opponent prattles without any base and sense of shame; so he deserves nothing but ridicule.

Through argumentations certain persons attempt to

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

prove the ancient grammars baseless; and proclaim them unacceptable [although] the trinity of sages has not repudiated them. The fact is that many people accept this (the grammar of the three sages) because it has more merits when compared with others; that is why this person mistakes all other treatises to be false.

37. एवमस्माभिर्व्याकरणान्तरप्रामाण्ये साधिते सति यत् पुनः परेणाप्रामाण्यसाधनं कृतं तदर्थाद् गर्भस्रावेण गतमपीदानीं प्रत्येकयुक्त्युपादानेन खण्ड्यते।।

37. In this way, by establishing the authority of other grammars though the attempt of the opponent to establish their non-authority has' been implicitly washed out, his arguments will be repudiated now by showing detailed reasons.

38. तत्र यत् तावदुक्तं शङ्कराचार्य प्रभृतिभिः श्रुतिव्याख्यादिषु **पाणिनीयमेव गृहीतमिति तस्यैव प्रामाण्यम्, अन्वव्याकरणानां व्याख्यानागृहीतत्वादप्रामाण्यम्** इति तदसारम्। शङ्कराचार्य-मुरारारिप्रभृतिभिरपि स्वप्रयोगमूलत्वेन व्याकरणान्तराणामङ्गीकरणात्। व्याख्यादिषु ग्रहणाग्रहणयोः बहुप्रसिद्ध्यल्पप्रसिद्धिनिबन्धनत्वेन प्रामाण्याप्रामाण्यप्रयोजक-त्वाभावात्। विद्यारण्यादिभिश्च **अल्पमेधः** पदादिव्याख्याने, क्षीरस्वामिसर्वानन्दसुबोधिनीकारादिभिश्च अमरसिंह निघण्टु-व्याख्याने तत्र तत्राङ्गीकृतत्वाद् वेदनिघण्टुव्याख्यात्रा च भोज

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
सूत्रस्य सर्वत्राङ्गीकृतत्वाद्,व्याख्यानादिष्वपरिगृहीतत्वास्याप्यसिद्धेः। पाणिनीयप्राक्काले च तेषामेव प्रामाण्यमङ्गीकार्यम्। न च सिद्धस्य प्रमाण्यस्य नाशे कारणमस्ति इत्याद्युक्तमेव।।

38. It has been said (by. the opponent) that *Sankarācārya* and others while interpreting the revealed texts have accepted Paninian grammar alone; So it alone is authoritative. The other grammars do not have authority because they are not accepted for the sake of interpreting |the revealed texts].

This is flimsy. Even *Sankarācārya, Murāri* and others have accepted other grammars as the basis of their, usages. The acceptance or non-acceptance for the sake of interpretation is due to their (i.e., the grammars) being known more widely, or less; they (i.e., the acceptance or non-acceptance) do not serve, in establishing authority or non-authority. The argument itself that they (i.e., the other grammars) are not accepted for the purpose of interpretation is not correct;: for *Vidyāranya* while considering the word. *kathāpayati*, the author of *Prasada*[136] in many places of his commentary, *Visveśvara* - the commentator on

[136] VItthala, the commen tator on the Prakriyākaumudi.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Naisadha[137] - in interpreting the word alpamedhas, *Kşirasvām*,[138] *Sarvänanda*[139] and the author of the *Subodhini*[140] in interpreting the Lexicon of *Amarasimh* have accepted them (i.e., the other grammar). in the course of their commentaries. The commentator on the Vedic Lexicon[141] has accepted the aphorisms of *Bhoja* throughout. And in the age before Pānini their authority alone has to be accepted. It has been already said that there is no reason for the fading away of the authority once established.

39. यत्तु मुनित्रयवचनस्य एत एव साधुशब्दाः इति नियमपरत्वाद् एतद्विरोधादन्यशास्त्राणां त्याज्यत्वमुक्तम्, तदपि नियमस्य शास्त्रस्वभावत्वे पाणिनिनियमितत्वाद् वार्तिकाप्रामाण्यं स्यादिति बहुधा परोक्तनियमपरत्व-निरसनादपास्तमेव। विरोध चैकमेव ग्राह्यमित्येतच्च

---

137 Padavākyārthupañcikā, Adyar Library, MS. No. 68474. Descriptive Catalogue, vol. V, S. No. 174. On leaf No. 128: मन्दाल्पाभ्यां च मेधाद् इति महोपाध्यायवर्धमानस्सू (सू)त्रम्।

138 The Commen tary is called Amarakaśodghät ana. Edn. Poona, 1913, 1943.

139 The commentary is called Tikāsarvasvam. The author belonged to the Vandi-........atiya family and the work was composed in 1160 A.D.

140 This is a very elaborate commentary on the Amarakośa by Jataveda-dīksfta Son of Devanabhatta. The author is supposed to have fourished in the latter part of the twelfth century.

141 Durgacarya, the commentator on the Nirukta of Yaska.

षोडशिग्रहणाग्रहणादौ स्मृतिचन्द्रिकाद्युक्तस्मृतिद्वयोक्त-विकल्पनीयत्वे च व्यभिचरितमित्युक्तप्रायम्। विरोधश्च नियमाभावान्नास्तीत्युक्तम्।।

39. Then it is said (by the opponent) that the other grammars are. To De rejected because of their conflict with what is said by the trinity of sages, whose rules are restrictive that 'these alone are correct words'. This [argument| has also been set aside by refuting in more than one way the restrictive nature [of Paninian rules] advanced by the opponent. The reason is also shown that if the Paninian rules are restrictive, the vartikas would also become non-authoritative. The argument that where there is a conflict between two views either alone must be accepted is also shown as inconclusive in the instances of "the taking up or not taking up of sodaśi' and of the alternatives put forth by two moral codes as represented in the Smrticandrika, etc. That there is no Conflict because of the absence of restriction (in Paninian rules) is also affirmed.

40. यत्तु व्यासोक्तानां प्रातिशाख्यरूपासाधरणव्याकरण-मूलत्वमिति, तदपि न। अपाणिनीयत्वसाम्येऽप्यसाधारण-व्याकरणानामिष्टत्वे साधारणेषु विद्वेषे च निमित्तं नास्तीत्युक्तत्वात्। छान्दससूत्रैः एत एव वेदे साधव इति नियमितत्वेन परमते प्रातिशाख्यप्रामाण्यस्यापि दुःसाधत्वाच्च।।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

40. [The opponents' view] that the usages of Vyasa are based on the special grammars called Pratisākhyas, is also not correct. Because it has already been pointed out that when both are equal in respect of their being non-Paninian, there is no reason to favour the special grammars and hate the general ones. In addition, it will be hardly possible in the view of the opponent to maintain the authority of the *Pratisākhyas*, in as much as (according to him) the rules (of Pänini) on the Vedic language have already laid down the restriction that 'these' [usages] alone are correct in the *Vedas*'.

41. यत्तु आचार्यसङ्कीर्तनस्य विकल्पाद्यर्थत्वेनोपपत्तेः न तत्प्रामाण्यमङ्गीकृतमिति, तदपि न। **तन्मतमेवं तन्मतमेवम्** इति तन्मतस्य प्रामाण्यानङ्गीकरणे विकल्पस्यैवासिद्धेः स्ववाग्विरुद्धत्वात्। न च सङ्कीर्तनमात्राद् विकल्प उत्तिष्ठति। प्रामाण्यानङ्गीकारे पूजार्थत्वं तु दूरापास्तम्।।

41. Then it has been said that since the references to the names of ancient teachers can be explained by assuming the purpose of making the rules optional, their authority has not been accepted. This is also not true. While saying 'this is my view and this is his', if the authority of the other is not accepted, there can be no alternative at all; so it is self-contradictory. By simple mentioning of the name [of the teachers] the rule cannot become optional; and if [their] authority is not

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

accepted, there is no question of maintaining them (i.e., the references) as indicating reverence.

42. यत्तु मीमांसादावनभिमताचार्यसङ्कीर्तनवदिदमुपपन्नमिति, तन्न। तत्र दूष्यत्वेनैव तन्मतोपादानात्। इह तु तदभावात्। न च **तत्र प्रमाणं बादरायणस्यानपेक्षत्वाद्** इत्यादौ ग्राह्यतासङ्कीर्तनेऽपि देवताविग्रहवत्त्वादौ तन्मतस्य परित्यागदर्शनादत्रापि तथा इति वाच्यम्। तत्रापि मतभेदेन सर्ववैदिकपक्षाणां गृह्यमाणत्वदर्शनात्।।

42 Then it has been argued that this (i.e., references to ancient teachers) can happen as is found in the *Mimansa*, etc., where the name of unacceptable predecessors are (some' times) mentioned. This is also not sound; for there the other's view is mentioned for criticising it; whereas here there is no such thing. [The argument] that though in (the *Mimāmsā-sutra*) - *tatpramānam badarāyanasyānapeksatvāt*[142] the other's view is mentioned as acceptable, while discussing the deities having a body, etc.[143], other's

---

[142] Jaimini-sütra, I. 1. 5.

[143] ibid. X. 4. 23. Although Jaimini does not explicitely say that deities'to whom oblations are offered do not have a physique, Sabara states: नन्वेवं शब्द एव देवता प्राप्नोति। अत्रोच्यते। नैतदस्माभिः परिहर्तव्यम्। न हीदमुच्यमानमस्मत्पक्षं बाधते। Also see Khandadeva on this. cf. Naişadhlya-carita, V. 39:

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
view is rejected; so here (in the case of grammar) also the same can happen is un-sound. For there also all Schools of the Vedists are found to have been accepted as different Views.

43. यत्तु कौमुदीकारादिभिः स्वबुद्धिविस्तारबोधनार्थमेव मतान्तरप्रदर्शनं कृतम्, न तत्प्रामाण्यादिति, तदप्यबद्धम्। अप्रमाण्यभूतस्य कथने स्वबुद्धिमान्द्यस्यैव प्रकाशन-प्रसङ्गादिति। एव परोक्तावस्मदुक्तविरुद्धों,,शः खण्डितः।

ततोऽन्यग्रन्थसन्दोहैर्मदुक्तान्येव साधयन्।

वैनतेयो ममात्यन्तं बन्धुरेवेति शोभनम्।।

43. It has also been said that the author of the *Kaumudi* and others have quoted the views of others in order to reveal the expansion of their Own intellect, and not because of others' authority. This [argument| lacks coherence. By quoting something which is not authoritative, the dullness of the intellect alone could be revealed. Thus in the opponent's contention those points which go against what we have said are refuted.

Therefore, everything is fine; because *Vainateya*! Who

विश्वरूपकलनादुपपन्नं तस्य जैमिनिमुनित्वमुदीये।

विग्रहं मखभुजामसहिष्णुर्व्यर्थतां मदशनिं स निनाय।।

In Public Domain, Digitization-Muthulakshmi Research Academy

by citing a multitude of others' works only establishes what I have said, is indeed, a very close friend of mine.

******

हे ! श्रीमच्चोळदेशप्रथितबुधवराः शब्दशास्त्रान्तराणां

कोऽप्यप्रामाण्यमूचे किमपि निगदितं तत्र चास्माभिरेवम्।

कौमुद्यां धातुवृत्त्यादिषु कथिततया वैदिकाङ्गत्वसाम्याद्

युष्माकं सम्मतं स्यादिति लिखितमिदं शोधयध्वं महान्तः।।

श्रीसोमेश्वरदीक्षिताभिधमहाविद्वत्कुलाग्रेसरा

मीमांसाद्वयशब्दतर्ककुशला युष्मानधृष्योन्नतीन्।

तत्त्वज्ञान् करुणानिधीन् प्रशमिनः श्रुत्वेदमभ्यर्थये

यत् किञ्चिल्लिखितं मयाऽत्र तदितं स्वीकार्यमार्यात्मभिः।।

युष्माभिः खलु कामदेवविजये व्यालेखि कक्ष्याक्रम-

स्तं द्रष्टुं भृशमुत्सुका वयमतः सम्प्रेष्यतां साम्प्रतम्।

युष्माद्दक्षविचक्षणोक्तिपदवीसम्प्रेक्षणेन क्षणा-

दस्माकं खलु बुद्धिशुद्धिरुदियादित्येष(रुदयेदि) तत्राशयः।।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

प्रयुक्तहेतौ सति कामदेवे कृतोऽस्य भङ्ग पटुदर्शनेन।

सोमेश्राख्याग्रहणस्य(ग्रगणस्य) चैतत्सर्वज्ञभावस्य च युक्तरूपम्।।

युष्मद्वैदुष्यधूतं(धूतः) खलु कटकभुवि त्रायते भोगिराजं(राजो)

वाणीवेणीविधूतामपि सुरसरितं(सरितः)

कङ्कटीको जटायाम्(जटायाः)।

इत्येवं यज्ञनारायणविबुधमहादीक्षिताः शत्रुवर्ग-

त्राणाद् देवस्य तस्याप्यपहरथ

धिया साधु सार्वज्ञ्यगर्वम्(सर्वज्ञगर्वम्)।।

युष्मास्वेव क्षितीशो विपुलनयनिधिस्तिष्ठते राज्यदृष्टौ

तिष्ठध्वे यूयमेव प्रथितबुधजने सन्दिहाने समेते।

युष्मभ्यं तिष्ठते कस्त्रिदशगुरुसमानोऽपि युष्मादृगन्यः

प्रज्ञालुर्यं ज्ञनारायणविबुधमहादीक्षिता वीक्षते कः?।।

(प्रज्ञालून्, प्रज्ञालो) (दीक्षितान् वीक्ष्यते)

अस्वस्थाः केलस्थाः स्वयमतिमृदवस्तत्र चाहं विशेषात्

सर्वे दुरप्रचारे खलु शिथिलधियः किं पुनर्देशभेदे।

एवंभावेऽपि दैवात् कुहचन समये कल्यताकल्यते चेत्

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

प्रज्ञाब्धीन् यज्ञनारायणविबुधमहादीक्षितानीक्षिताहे।।

O! The renowned scholars of the celebrated Cola region!, someone declared the other grammars (than that of Pāṇini) to be devoid of authority; there upon we also said something as above. Since this (what I have said) has been enounced in the [works like] *Kaumudi* and *Dhatuvrtti* on the basis of their (i.e., the other grammars) being equally an auxiliary to the Veda (as the Paninian grammar), I have written down this with the hope that this would be acceptable to you, O! The eminent [scholars]! You may kindly scrutinize this.

O! Sri *Someśvaradikşita*![144] The foremost among the learned! O! The erudite in the Mimamsās, grammar and logic! Having heard of you as one of invincible nobility knowing the truth (of things), a reservoir of kindness and well composed, I entreat: Here is something written by me; you, the high minded, may kindly accept this.

You have written (it is known), the counter arguments in the *Kadmadevavijaya*[145]. We are extremely anxious to see it. It may therefore be immediately sent (to us). The idea [of this request] is that seeing the method of

---

144 He is yet to be identified.

145 According to the New Catalogus Catalogorum, vol. III, p. 348. *Kāmadeva-vijaya* is a work on grammar written by *Somesvara* in reply to a work by Kāmadeva.

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
argumentation set forth by the clear sighted [scholars] like you, we may get our thoughts clarified at once.

When Kämadeva'[146] employed the reasoning (also directed the weapon)[147] its (also his) destruction was effected by you through effective observations (also glance).[148] This is indeed proper for one who owns the name *somesvara* and is omniscient.

There is the god who having armoured himself well protects the king of serpents, who was pushed aside by your erudition, by placing him as a bracelet; and the divine river who was cast away by the force of your oration, by placing her in his matted hair. In this way, O! The learned *Yajnanārāyana Dikşita*! you steal away, by your intelligence, the pride of omniscience of even that god, who affords protection to your enemies.[149]

---

[146] An author of that name as well as the god of love:

[147] The word hetau is taken here as the saptami of hetu with reference to the author Kāmadeva and hetu with referenee to. Kāmadeva (god of love)

[148] Someśvara Dīkşita retaliated the arguments of the author Kāmadeva by critical observations, while God Siva destroyed Kāmadeva by His glance.

[149] The thousand-tongued mythical serpent is supposed to be having infinite knowledge. The power ot speech is, always compared to the force of current of *Gañgā*: The idea seems to be that Siva is protecting them without knowing their defeat at Yajñanārāyana's hands. The knowledge of the scholar, therefore, surpasses that of the God.

The King who is extensively learned in Politics depends on you to take decision in the matters concerning the country; when renowned scholars assemble with some doubt, you alone stand as the judge; who, even if he be equal to the preceptor of the gods, can stand up to you?[150] O! Yajnanārāyaṇa Dikşita! Can any other person who equals you in wisdom be found?

The people in Kerala in general are very delicate and sickly, and especially so is my humble self. Everyone is lukewarm towards travelling even a distance; what about then going to another region? In spite of ṭhis, if by chance at some time health would allow me to have it; I will certainly meet the great scholar Yajnanārāyana Dikşita, the ocean of wisdom.

---

[150] The root *sthā* in *ātmanepada* 1s used here in its various meanings. In the first second instances, it is according to Pa. I. 3. 23. *Prakāśana-stheyākhyayoś ca.* PS under ibid. states that Bhatti, etc., Interpret the word *stheya* as one who depends on others for taking a decision or who himself is the judge when others seek a decision. Here the root is used in both the senses, respectively. The third sense 'to stand up to is found in the third usage of the root in the verse.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

अपाणिनीयाः (उणादि) प्रयोगाः

काव्यस्य *क्वचित्सुयोज्या धात्वर्थाः काप्योज्या उणादिषु*[151] इति व्याख्यानोक्त्या ज्ञायते यत् काव्ये उणादिप्रयोगाणां वैशिष्ट्यमपि विद्यत इति। अतः तेषाम् उणादिसूत्राणामौचित्यं किमस्तीति विचारस्यावश्यकता वरीवर्ति। वस्तुतः शब्दनिष्पत्तौ येषां यौगिकत्वं क्लिष्टं तेषां सिद्धये उणादिसूत्राणि प्रोक्तानि इति विदुषां मतम्। किञ्च तेषामुपादेयत्वविषये पण्डितानां नैकमत्य भजते। किन्तु पाणिनिः सर्वानेव शब्दान् यौगिकान् मन्यते। येषां सुस्पष्टं यौगिकत्वं ते हि शब्दानुशासने व्याख्याताः। येषाञ्च यौगिकत्वं क्लिष्टं तेषां सिद्धये उणादिसूत्राणि प्रोक्तानि। तानि च *उणादयो बहुलम्(अष्टा.3.3.1)* इति सूत्रव्याख्यावसरे के च ते उणादयः, इति शिष्यैः पृष्टः आचार्यः पञ्चपादीन्युक्तवान् यस्या व्यवस्थितं स्वरूपमेव दशपादी। अस्यां प्रायः 759 सूत्राणि प्रोक्तानि। तेषामेव सूत्राणां सहयोगेन अभिनवशब्दोत्पत्तिरपि शक्यते। तेन लौकिकशब्दानाम् अपाणिनीयानीयत्वमेव न भजते। तथैव काव्येष्वपि उणादि सूत्राणामुदाहरणानि अपाणिनीयानि इति न कथ्यते। धातुकाव्ये च तेषां सूत्राणामुदाहरणानि नैकानि संलक्ष्यन्ते। यथा –

अतर्दकास्त्वद्य विकर्दमाशयाः प्रखर्दवृत्तैरसमन्तितान्तिकाः।

---

[151] धा.का. 3.66

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

श्रुतान्दुकैश्चित्तगजेन्द्ररोधिनस्तुष्यन्तु सन्तो गुणबिन्दुलोलुपाः।।[152]

इत्यत्र *अति अदि बन्धने* इति धातुः ***अन्दूदृम्भकफेलूकर्कन्धूदिधिषूः****(उणा. 1.90)* इत्यनेन उ प्रत्यये, स्वार्थे कनि ***केऽणः****(अष्टा.7.4.13)* इत्यनेन च ह्रस्वे *अन्दुकैः* इत्युदाहृतम्।

एवमेवान्यस्मिन् श्लोके यथा -

एरवच्चकोरोत्करमिङ्खितं शुकैः, प्रेङ्खल्लतावल्गनरङ्गमण्डपम्।

विलङ्घदेणं शवराङ्गनाजनप्रवङ्गितं मङ्गलधेनुतङ्गितम्।।[153]

अत्र *मगि गतौ* इति धातुः ***मङ्गलेरलच्*** *(उणा. 5.88)* इत्यनेन अलच् प्रत्यये मङ्गलः इति प्रयुक्तः। एवं धातुकाव्ये प्रस्तुतानि नैकानि उणादिसूत्राणामुदाहरणानि प्रतीयन्ते। तेषु कानिचन पट्टके प्रस्तूयन्ते यथा–

क्र.सं.	उणादि सूत्रं प्रत्ययश्च	धातुकाव्यप्रयोगः श्लोकसंख्या च
1	इषमिदमुदिखिदिछिदिभिदिमन्दि (1.50) किरच्	मन्दिरात् 1.3
2	पर्दैर्नित्संप्रसारणमल्लोपश्च (3.82) आकु	पृदाकुः 1.5
3	कृश्टशलिगर्दिभ्योऽभच् (3.121) अभच्	गर्दभः 1.8

[152] धा.का. 1.9

[153] धा.का. 1.20

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

4	स्फायितञ्चिवञ्चिशकिक्षिपि..... (3.13) रक्	चन्द्र 1.10
5	सलिकल्यनिमहिभिभण्डिशण्डिपिण्डि कुकिभूभ्य इलच् (1.53) इलच्	कोकिल 1.13
6	रङ्घिलङ्घ्योर्नलोपश्च (1.29) उ	लघु 1.15
7	मङ्गेरलच् (5.88) अलच्	मङ्गलः 1.20
8	स्फायितञ्चि......(2.13) रकि नलोपश्च	आवक्र 1.26
9	खजेराकः (4.13) आक	खाजकम् 1.31
10	सलिकल्यनिभटिभण्डितण्डिभ्य इलच् (1.53) इलच्	भण्डिल 1.36
11	दृसनिजनिचरिचटिरहिभ्यो ञुण् (1.3) ञुण्	चाटु 1.39
12	अशुप्रुषिलटिकणिखटिविशिभ्यः क्वन्(1.140) क्वन्	खट्वा 1.41
13	पर्फरीकादश्च (4.20)	पुण्डरीक 1.43
14	वेपितुह्योर्ह्रस्वश्च(2.52) इनच्	विपिन 1.47
15	भृमृदृशियजिपर्व्यमिनमिहर्यिभ्योऽतच् (3.109) अतच्	हर्यतैः, पर्वतः 1.66, 73
16	इण्सिञ्दीङुष्यविभ्यो नक् (3.2)	उष्ण 1.87
17	क्वुन् शिल्पिसंज्ञयोः(2.32)	मशकस्य 1.90
18	पतेरङ्गच् पक्षिणि(1.111) अङ्गच्	पतङ्गाम् 2.22
19	बहुलमन्यत्रापि (2.48) इनच्	नलिनीः 2.22
20	छित्वरच्छत्वर.....(3.1) चीवरशब्दो	चीवरीभिः2.27

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

	निपात्यते	
21	क्विब्वचिप्रच्छिश्रिदुस्रुकटप्रुज्वां दीर्घोऽसम्प्रसारणं च(2.58) क्विप् दीर्घश्च	श्रियम् 2.29
22	हसिमृग्रिण्वामिदमिलूपूधुर्विभ्यस्तन् (3.87) तन्	गर्तम् 2.34
23	कृषेर्वर्णे (3.4) नक्	कृष्णम् 2.40
24	ऋज्रेन्द्र....(2.28) रनि	क्षुरः 2.47
25	विषेः किच्च(3.39) नु	विष्णुः 2.55
26	घर्मग्रीष्मः(1.138) मक्	घर्म 2.55
27	तृषिशुषरसिभ्यः कित् (3.12) नन्	तृष्णा 2.66
28	कृवापाजिमिस्वदि साध्यशुभ्य उण् (1.1) साधेः उण्	साधोः2.69
29	अर्जिदृशिकम्यमिपंसि बाधाम् (1.17) कु प्रत्ययः दीर्घश्च	पांसुः 3.23
30	स्तनिहृषिपुषिगमिमदिभ्यो णेरित्नुच् (3.29) इत्नुच्	स्तनयित्नु 3.53

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Sanskrit Academy

Adarsha Shodha Sansthan

(Recognised by Central Sanskrit University, New Delhi)

Osmania University Campus, Hyderabad – 500 007

2022

978-93-80171-78-4